

13835

Advertisement.

THE greatest part of the following
ing Sherry was before
DR. PARRY'S
DR. WARRINGTON was honored with

DEFENSE

of Bristol. This Author hopes
will be deemed a sufficient apology for
THE BISHOP OF LONDON.

unfavourable to the Episcopal dignity,
especially as the Bishop of London is

[PRICE, ONE SHILLING.]

LONDON:
J. JOHNSON.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE greatest part of the following Sheets being printed off before DR. WARBURTON was honored with a MITRE, he is spoken of throughout (except in the Title-page) as DEAN of *Bristol*. This, the Author hopes, will be deemed a sufficient apology for any expressions, which may be thought unsuitable to the EPISCOPAL dignity, especially as the most exceptionable are borrowed from the DIVINE LEGATION.

HARBOROUGH,
JAN. 7, 1760.



A
D E F E N S E
O F

The Lord Bishop of LONDON's
INTERPRETATION
O F

The famous TEXT in the Book of JOB,
I know that my Redeemer liveth, &c.

AGAINST THE
E X C E P T I O N S
O F

The Bishop of GLOCESTER,
AND
The Examiner of the Bishop of LONDON's
Principles.

With occasional REMARKS on the *Argument* of
the DIVINE LEGATION, so far as this Point is
concerned with it.

BY RICHARD PARRY, D.D. *R*

RECTOR OF WITCHAMPTON, IN DORSETSHIRE;
AND PREACHER AT HARBOROUGH, IN LEICESTERSHIRE.

EST GENUS HOMINUM, QUI ESSE PRIMOS SE OMNIUM
RERUM VOLUNT—NEC SUNT.

NORTHAMPTON:

Printed and sold by C. DICEY; and by LOCKYER DAVIS and
CHARLES REYMERS, in LONDON. 1760.

A
DEFENSE

OF

The Lord Bishop of LONDON:

INTERPRETATION

OF

The famous TEXT in the book of JOB

I know that thy Redeemer liveth, &c.

AGAINST THE

EXCEPTIONS

The Bishop of CESTER



The Reviewer of the Bishop of LONDON:
Principles.

With occasional Remarks on the Agreement of
the Divine Legislation, so far as this point is
concerned with it.

By RICHARD PARRY, D.D.

Rector of WITCHAMPTON, in Dorsetshire;
And Preacher at HARROGATE, in Yorkshire.
EST GENUS HOMINUM, QUI SINE PRIMO SE OMNINO
SERVUM VOLUNT—NEC SUNT.

NORWICH.

Printed and sold by C. DICKY; and by LOCKYER DAVIS and
CHARLES REYNOLDS, in LONDON, 1790.

TO

THE RIGHT REVEREND

J O H N

BY DIVINE PERMISSION

LORD BISHOP OF *LINCOLN*

THIS VINDICATION

OF HIS ILLUSTRIOUS FRIEND

IS

WITH ALL RESPECT

INSCRIBED.

TO THE

DEAR SIR

OF THE

IN THE

OF THE

THIS VINDICATION

OF HIS

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

A
D E F E N S E
O F

The Bishop of *LONDON*'s
INTERPRETATION of the famous **TEXT**
in the Book of *JOB*,

I know that my Redeemer liveth, &c.

THE Dean of *Bristol*, and his obsequious admirer, the *Free Examiner* of the principles advanced in the Bishop of *London*'s discourses, having treated his lordship with much rudeness, it was expected, that affection or interest would have prompted some of his friends or dependents to appear in his vindication. This, I think, has not been done. I, who have no personal connection with the Bishop, nor prejudice against the Dean, have therefore undertaken a defense of the old interpretation, as an attempt, at least, to do justice to his lordship, and to his subject.

The apparent design of the book of Job is to account for and explain that great mystery of providence----the inequality of God's dealings with the children of men. This is a difficulty, that has much embarrassed speculative men in all ages of the world. And nothing but a future day of recompense can afford a rational and well-grounded solution of it. To make way for this inquiry, we are told in the prologue, (for the work is evidently of the dramatic kind) that *Satan*, an adversary of God and goodness, is permitted, by the sovereign disposer of all events, to exercise one of the best of men, for a trial of his integrity, with a various train of afflictions. Some old friends, hearing of his sufferings, make an appointment to go to mourn with, and to comfort him. But, miserable comforters as they were! instead of pouring oil into the wounds of one who was ready to perish, they even inflame them by the sharpness of their reproaches.

They insist, notwithstanding the repeated remonstrances of the sufferer, that he must needs be as wicked as he was miserable. *Is not this thy fear*, says one of them, with an insolent taunt, *thy confidence, thy hope, and the uprightness of thy ways? Remember, I pray thee, who ever perished, being innocent? or where were the righteous cut off? Even, as I have seen, they that plow iniquity, and sow wickedness, reap the same. By the blast of God*

God they perish, and by the breath of his nostrils are they consumed. iv. 6---9. And the others address him in the same strain.

JOB insists, on the contrary, that sufferings are no sure indications of guilt; that good and evil are dealt out promiscuously; and that the righteous are, at least, as liable to misfortunes as the unrighteous. *This is the one thing, (the great point in controversy) therefore I say it; he destroyeth the perfect and the wicked.* ix. 22.

The debate being carried on to a considerable length, and both parties, as usual, sticking to their first sentiments, JOB, quite wearied with his own sufferings, and the reproaches of his friends, breaketh out---

Oh that my words were now written! Oh that they were printed in a book! that they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever---Namely---

I know that my Redeemer is the life, and that he will raise up the dust at the last day; and though together with my skin (worms) destroy this (body) yet after my flesh I shall see God; whom I shall see for me; even so mine eyes shall behold (him) and not an adversary, (for) my reins are consumed within me. xix. 23---7.

It is apparent, says the Bishop, that JOB founds his hopes, whatever they were, on the power of his Redeemer; and therefore we may expect to find in what is said of him plain marks of power. *I know that my*

Redeemer liveth. [Rather, is *the life*; which implies, not only that he lives, but also that he is the author and fountain of life to others. *I am the resurrection and the life.* John xi. 25.] This is a just reflection, and proper to the case. And if you consider these words as spoken by a man, in his own opinion, ready to expire under grief of mind and pain of body, they necessarily imply a hope extending itself beyond the grave. His thought is this; I am dying, but I know my Redeemer is *the life*, and therefore I will trust in him for deliverance. But where is the sense or comfort of this, upon supposition that nothing can be done to help us after death? *Use and intent of prophecy* 232.

And that he will raise up the dust at the last day. Our public translation says, *he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth.* The Bishop justly finding fault with this version, as attributing to the Redeemer no marks of power, renders the passage thus; *he shall at the latter day arise with power over the dust.* I have taken the liberty of proposing a new translation, which is more direct and literal. The original word HAPHAR is frequently used to express that *dust*, out of which the first man was made, and to which all men must return. *Elibu* uses the word in this sense; *All flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust.* xxxiv. 15. And the verb KUM often signifies to *raise*. Thus *Hos. vi. 2.* *in the third day he will raise us up.*

up. And the particle HAL, as may be seen in *Noldius*, is sometimes redundant, though there is no necessity for supposing it to be so in the place before us. The passage then may be translated literally in the following manner: *I know that my Redeemer is the life, and that at the last day he will raise up the dust.*

But take his lordship's translation, or mine, the sense is the same. JOB puts the case of his being utterly destroyed, and his body reduced to dust and ashes; and yet his confidence is, that after he had put off his flesh he should see God. And if you take the reason he gives for his hope, as it will come out upon this sense of the expression, you will see a propriety and justness in the whole passage. "As for myself, says he, I am waiting away, and this body shall soon return to dust again; but my Redeemer is the life, and I know that he will raise up the dust at the last day, and after my flesh I shall see God my judge, not (as he now seems to be) against me, but for me." You see how the parts agree. JOB, though sensible that he should soon return to dust, yet trusted in God, knowing that he could as soon restore him from dust, as he at first made him and all men out of the dust of the ground.

In short, suppose JOB to expect a future time of judgment, the whole passage is exceeding beautiful and proper. "I find, says he, that my complaint is disregarded here; that man has no compassion for me, and that
God

God suffers the *innocent*, as well as the *guilty*, to be *unfortunate* in *this* life. But the time will come when my plea shall be heard; and so satisfied am I in the righteousness of it, that I would have it remain as my monument for ever, graven in the rock; for though I myself shall soon be gone, yet my Redeemer is the life, and will at the last day call me from the grave, and I shall see God my saviour." But if you suppose JOB to expect only a *temporal* restitution, within the compass of his own life, to what end or purpose does he so passionately wish to have his confidence rendered immortal? What sense is there in saying, "*Oh* that my confidence which you now despise may never be *forgotten*! for I know that within a *little while* I shall be restored to all my glory and former felicity, and shall have no cause to complain any more."---In one view, the images are lively and passionate, the sentiments just and proper; in the other, there is neither force, nor vigor, nor propriety, nor indeed, hardly, any sense.

Thus far, with some little alteration, in the words of the illustrious author of the *use and intent of prophecy*.

*And though together with * my skin worms destroy this body, yet after my flesh I shall see God.* Whatever JOB's hopes and expectations were,

* See *Noldius*.

were, he plainly puts his case at the very worst. His *skin* was at this time totally corrupted; and the whole mass of his materials was so strangely altered, that he could not find a name to express it by. *Though together with my skin worms destroy this*—he knew not what to call it. This, added to the accounts he gives of himself elsewhere, looks as if he thought himself too far gone to expect a change for the better in this life. If such indeed were his expectations, for which he could not possibly have any rational grounds, the violence of the distemper seems to have seized his brain. But, allowing him to speak here of a temporal restoration, the text so interpreted can be of no use to the author of the *Divine Legation*. Even then, the words are so far from excluding a future state, that they necessarily suppose it. *I know*, says he, *that in my flesh I shall see God*. Why does he say, *in his flesh*? If there is no future state, or if he knew nothing of any, he could not but see God *in his flesh*, that is, before he died, if he saw him at all. When therefore this good man said, *in my flesh I shall see God*, (and surely he did not say so for nothing) he doubtless intended to express an assurance of seeing him here, *as well as* hereafter. But as this sense of the words is inconsistent with the hypothesis of the D. L. I may dismiss it, and offer another translation, which is more consistent with the design of the passage, if it relates to Job's hopes

hopes of a resurrection. We may therefore render the words thus; *after my flesh*, that is, after I have put off my flesh, I shall see God. And thus they must be rendered, if JOB is indeed speaking of another life; for *flesh and blood*, as St. Paul observes, shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

To this may be added, that if JOB speaks here of a temporal deliverance, he contradicts the whole tenor of his argument and of his hopes. *O remember that my life is wind; mine eye shall no more see good.* vii. 7.

If the words are to be understood of a temporal restitution, they are nothing to the purpose. The question debated is, *Whether God administers his government over men here with an equal providence, so as that the good are always prosperous, and the bad unhappy; or whether, on the contrary, there be not such apparent inequalities, as that prosperity and adversity often happen indifferently to good and bad.* JOB maintains the latter part, and his three friends the former. D. L. V. 2. P. 2. 233---40. 3d Ed. JOB therefore, if he intended to speak to the purpose, could not speak of a temporal deliverance. The thing to be accounted for is his *present* distress. But what has his *future* prosperity to do with that? It might be some alleviation of his trouble, but it could not possibly be any proof of his innocence. His future prosperity would no more prove, that his past life was innocent, than his present

present sufferings would prove, that his past life was guilty.

But the words, immediately following the passage in question, are of themselves sufficient to settle the true and genuine sense of it. JOB had appealed to a future judgment, in the last day, when God would appear in his defense. This, says he, is *my hope, and my confidence. But ye shall say, Why have we persecuted him? seeing the root of the matter shall be found in me. Be ye afraid of the sword, for wrath, that is, by an easy figure, he that executeth wrath (will bring) the punishments of the sword, so that ye shall know there is a judgment. So that ye shall know, or acknowledge, there is a judgment. Where? not in this world, for JOB all along denies it, strenuously arguing against it from the inequalities of providence; and the three friends all along contend for it, maintaining, as strenuously, the equality of its dispensations. JOB must therefore mean a judgment hereafter, which he believed and hoped for; and which they themselves should one day both acknowledge and tremble at.*

I shall only observe farther, that the Greek translators, the heads and doctors of the Jewish law, as the Dean of *Bristol* calls them, who must needs know what was the current interpretation of this passage, confirm our account of it. The book in the original ends thus. *So Job died, being old and full of days.* To which they have added, *But it*

is written, *that he shall rise again*, *παλι*
αναστησεται, * *with those whom the Lord shall*
raise. *It is written*, is a Jewish phrase, and
 is always used in opposition to their unwritten
 traditions. So we find it used by the writers
 of the New Testament; and there is no
 reason to imagine, that they departed from
 the language of their countrymen. Now
 where *is it written*, that JOB shall *rise again*;
 but in the passage before us? There indeed
 it is written, according to his own prophetic
 wish, in the most legible characters. And
 there, we trust, it will remain, sacred and
 inviolable, as if it had been graven with an
 iron pen and lead in the rock,---for ever.

Enough, I presume, has been said in de-
 fense of what is called, with a contemptuous
 sneer, the *orthodox* interpretation of this cele-
 brated text. It is now time to see what has
 been urged against it.

The Dean of *Bristol* complains heavily of
 those hostile critics, who have dared to attack
 poor JOB---and him: He is far from think-
 ing himself unconcerned in this mischief.
 However, though he *is indeed to be reckoned*
amongst JOB's *persecutors*, yet he has this to
 say for himself, that the vexation he gave him
 was soon over." But how favorably soever
 the Dean may think of himself, and of his
 behaviour

* Does not this allude to their own translation of the passage?
Ανταος εστιν ο εκλυειν με μελλον επι γης ΑΝΑΣΤΗΞΑΙ
το δεσμα μου.

behaviour towards JOB, he is certainly the very worst adversary he had. The Devil brought him down from the palace to the dunghill. His friends insult him there. The Dean indeed, under a shew of friendship, restores him to his palace; but then, he cruelly persueth him beyond the grave, and robs him of his better hope of immortality.

At first setting out, he seemed well enough disposed to indulge the patriarch in his hopes of a resurrection. For, having brought down the date of the book so low (as the return from the captivity) he says, it is of little importance to his subject, whether this famous passage be understood of a *resurrection from the dead*, or only of *temporal deliverance from afflictions*. 295. Now, for all these big words, the success of his hypothesis depends, in a great measure, on the fate of this text. If it respects a future state, the fine-spun scheme of the D. L. is effectually ruined. For it is the great business of the work to prove, that, excepting some few favorites of heaven, who had the distinguished happiness of being initiated into the mysteries of the gospel, the future state was kept as an impenetrable secret from the rest of mankind. And this was in order to shew, that the antient Jews, in the time of *Moses*, knew nothing of it. But if it shall appear that JOB, an *Arabian*, and not of the chosen seed, was acquainted with the revealed doctrine of life and immortality, what should have hindered the
the

the *Israelites* from being acquainted with it too? Now in proof of *JOB*'s knowledge of a resurrection, we produce his own declaration in the passage before us, whether the book was written by the patriarch himself, by *Moses*, or even by *Ezra*. And if the Gentleman will lay his hand upon his head, he may chance to recollect this rule of good writing: *Nibil enim ex persona poetæ, sed omnia sub eorum qui illo tempore vixerunt, dixerunt.*

He seems to have been aware of this; for, upon second thoughts, he changes his mind, and, as *his* interpretation of the book * affords new assistance for determining the long debated question, it will not be improper, he says, to sound it to the bottom. 296.

He sets out thus. I. The understanding the words of a *resurrection* is repugnant to the whole tenor of the argument. *ibid.* This is at first sight surprizing, because *JOB* maintains the inequalities of providence; and surely nothing can be better calculated to account for those inequalities, than the principle of a resurrection. But the Dean argues against this sense from the following considerations.

First, The disputants are all equally *embarrassed* in adjusting the ways of providence, *JOB* affirms that the good man is sometimes unhappy. The three friends contend that the good man can never be unhappy, because
such

* See page 23.

such a situation would reflect dishonor on God's attributes. 297. All this embarrass is of the Dean's own making. The several disputants deliver their opinions with the greatest confidence, and with a clearness not to be met with in modern controversies. One party maintains, that God's ways are equal; the other, that they are unequal. Where now is the embarrassment? but in our critic, who will make what he cannot find. But the doctrine of a *resurrection*, supposed to be here urged by JOB, *cleared up* all this embarrass. If therefore his friends thought it true, it ended the dispute; * if false, it lay upon them to confute it. Yet they do neither. But without the least notice that any such thing had been urged, they go on, as they began, to inforce their former arguments, and to confute that which, they seem to understand, was the only one JOB had urged against them, *viz.* The consciousness of his own innocence. *ibid.* This dispute was not to be ended by the disputants; the decision was not to be made but by God himself, the great determiner of the controversy. This, as my author somewhere speaks, the *ordonance*

B

of

* Dr. Grey has fallen into a strange paralogism: *Jam vero si cardo controversiæ fuisset, utrum, salva Dei justitia, sancti in hac vita affligi possent, hæc ipsa declaratio litem finire debuerat.* Preface to the book of JOB. xv. JOB's declaration ought to have finished the dispute. As if all disputes were ended when they ought to be! And as if this controversy ought to have been ended by the disputants, in spite of the poet's intentions, which were to introduce Θεὸς αὐτομνηστὴς, God himself to determine it!

of the poem required. And though the Dean has confidently and peremptorily asserted, that the friends take not *the least notice* of a resurrection, supposed to be urged by JOB, yet it will appear that, in their way, they endeavour to confute it. The principle they proceed upon is this.---All things are regulated with the strictest justice here. Virtue always meets with her own reward, and vice with its proper punishment ---If this was true, it effectually demolished JOB's phantom of a resurrection, which he attempted proving from some supposed inequalities of providence. Accordingly *Zophar* presses this argument, and describes the punishment of the wicked to be just such a state as JOB then labored under. But suppose JOB spoke of a resurrection, *Zophar's* answer is wide of the purpose. 298. How so? Can the ways of providence be at once, in the same instance, and at the same time, both equal and unequal? If not---and if the principle *Zophar* proceeded on was right, That JOB, according to the established laws of providence, suffered the just punishment of his sins, then his answer was extremely pertinent and cogent. For remove the foundation, the inequalities of providence, and the resurrection, the superstructure raised upon it, must fall too.

2. But what is still more unaccountable, JOB, when he resumes the dispute, sticks to the argument he first set out with; and, though he

he found it gave his friends little satisfaction, he repeats it again and again. But this other argument of a *resurrection*, so full of piety and conviction, *which they had never ventured to reply to*, he never once resumes. 298.

The Dean is one of those obliging writers, who furnish answers to their own objections. He wonders that JOB, when he resumed the dispute, did not at the same time resume his former argument of a future state; and yet he confesses in the same breath, that the friends had not replied to it. JOB always speaks to the purpose, directing his arguments to what is said, not to what is not said. But he neither *upbraids* his adversaries for their silence; nor *triumphs*, as he well might, in their inability to answer it. *ibid.* This is Dr. Warburton to the life. If he had had the management of JOB, he would have taught him to upbraid his adversaries without mercy, and to triumph over them---without victory. But in the present case, there seems to have been no room for either. They deny the necessity of a future state, (and has not the Dean himself done the same?) because good and evil are so equally dispensed, that *no* observer of the law of God misses his reward, nor *any* transgressor escapes punishment. Hence they conclude JOB to be a sinner from his sufferings. Now what *conviction* could the argument of a resurrection work in such reasoners as these? They want it not; they have a convincing principle of their own, with

which they are perfectly well satisfied; and which in their opinion, and in the Dean's opinion too, supercedes the necessity of a resurrection. It would therefore have been absurd and ridiculous to attempt their conviction by arguing from a future state, unless he previously convinced them of the want of it.

Accordingly JOB addresses himself to secure this point. Zophar had described the state of the wicked, as if he had been drawing JOB's picture. JOB therefore, in his answer, presents him with another view of wicked men, *becoming old and mighty in power---their seed established in their sight with them---their houses safe from fear, nor the rod of God upon them---but spending their days in wealth, and in a moment going down to the grave.* And he concludes with this spirited sarcasm. *How then comfort ye me in vain, seeing in your answers there remaineth falsehood. xxi.* Their answers were indeed nothing but chicane and prevarication. For allowing that, in general, the dispensations of providence were equal, might not the case of JOB be an exception? Might there not be other excepted cases, produced by JOB, of prosperous iniquity, and of distressed virtue? If there were such Instances, then the argument of a resurrection would come in seasonably. And we may observe, that JOB's reasoning, throughout the whole dispute, is of a piece; the several parts are closely connected with each other, and tend to one point. Sometimes he presses his adversaries with one
part

part, sometimes with another, as occasions offer, but always with the same view. For where, let me ask, is the difference, whether he urged the inequalities of providence, in proof of a future state, or a future state to account for the inequalities of providence?

To this let me add, says the Dean, that if JOB spoke of a *resurrection*, he contradicts what he says in many places concerning the *irrecoverable dissolution* of the body. 299. Whether this is true, or not, will be seen hereafter. But allowing it to be true, why may not the defenders of the common system claim the benefit of the Dean's solution? for even in the sense of a temporal deliverance JOB, it is confessed, contradicts what he said in his despair.---There is a manifest difference between a contradiction of *opinion* and *belief*, and of *passion* and *affection*. And for this he apologises, when he is come to himself, by desiring that this confidence in his deliverer might be engraved on a rock as the opinion he would stand to. *ibid.*

3. But, what is the strangest of all, neither *Elibu*, nor God himself, gives us the least hint of this principle of a resurrection. Those, who contend for this interpretation, suppose the notion to be here delivered in order to support its truth. What reason then can they give, why neither the moderator nor decider should employ it to clear up difficulties, when JOB himself had *touched* upon it before? *Elibu* justifies God's conduct; God bears

witness to JOB's innocence; yet both concur in resolving all into power omnipotent. This tends more to cloud than to clear up the obscurities of the debate. In a word, no solution is given, though a decision be made. All this, on the common system, is quite unaccountable to our faculties of understanding.

300.

What reason can be given, why the *decider* of the controversy should not employ the principle of a *resurrection*, when JOB had *touched upon it* before? In what a gentle manner JOB had *touched upon* this principle, we have seen already. To the question, I reply, he hath employed it. For God, says the Dean, bears witness to JOB's *innocence*. What innocence? Not the innocent part of his life before he suffered, (for there is not a single word said of that) but the innocent---the noble---part he sustained in the debate concerning the ways of providence. *Ye have not spoken of ME*, says God, *the thing that is right, as my servant JOB hath*. xlii. 7. And this easily accounts for that severe sentence passed upon the three friends for the crime of *impiety*. [For what can be a greater instance of impiety, than denying a future state?] A thing, as the Dean is pleased to observe, *utterly inexplicable* on the common interpretation. For let them be as guilty as you please to JOB, they are all the way advocates for God; and *hold nothing concerning his government that did not become his nature and character*. 291. We have seen what JOB held,

held, and what they held, concerning God's government. We have seen also that God, the great determiner of the controversy, has decided in favor of JOB. *YE have not spoken of me the thing that is right like my servant JOB.* And whom are we to believe? God himself, or the presumptuous author of the D. L.

But he assigns two reasons, why the *three friends* are condemned by God. 1. Because using the argument of an *equal providence* only to condemn JOB with the heart of an enemy, they made the honor of God a stale to their malignant purposes. 275. A mere finesse! to say no worse of it. For God, it is plain, does not censure their *thoughts*, but their *words*. *Ye have not SPOKEN of me the thing that is right.* 2. The second reason of the condemnation of these *friends* was, because *they* had supported *their* condemnation of JOB by a pretended revelation. *Now a thing was secretly brought to me,* says Eliphaz — 276. And so because Eliphaz, one of the friends, had pretended a revelation, the *rest* were equally involved in the same judgment! — To such wretched shifts must the best writers be reduced, when they are once possessed, as the Dean happily expresses it, by the unclean spirit of *refinement*.

But why, may it be asked, is the *power of God* so much insisted on both by *Elihu* and by God himself? For the same reason that it is so much insisted on by JOB in other parts

of the book. It was the theme and business of the author, says the Bishop, to maintain the supremacy of God, and to guard it against every false notion. In opposition to the idolatrous practice of worshipping the sun, moon, and stars, he asserts God to be the maker of all the host of heaven. *By his spirit hath he garnished the heavens.* In opposition to the false notion of two independent principles, he asserts God to be the maker of him who was the author of evil. *His hand hath formed the crooked serpent.* 215, 6. To which let me add a third reason. In opposition to the impious opinion of the impossibility of a resurrection, the constant topic of unbelievers in every age, it is asserted, that with God all things are possible.

The Dean proceeds to consider next, whether *his* sense of the words agrees better with the tenor of the dispute. JOB's meaning is, that God will at length bring the good man out of trouble. 301. The case of JOB is that of afflicted virtue. The words must therefore be so interpreted as to suit the case of good men in general, (I mean Jews) *represented by JOB*, under affliction. It is incumbent then on this author to prove that, in the age when this book was written, God delivered *the good man*, that is, *every good Jew*, out of trouble. A hopeful undertaking truly! And yet, if it he was able to prove it, he would still have the mortification to find, that his pains and labor have been employed to no purpose. For,
after

after all, the point in controversy between JOB and his friends is not, Whether God will bring the good man *out of* trouble, but, whether he brings him *into* any.

He says indeed, JOB's general thesis is, that though providence is not equally administered, yet at last God will bring the good man out of trouble, and punish the wicked. 303.

Then JOB knew nothing of his own thesis. With regard to the wicked, he says in his very next speech, *Wherefore do the wicked live? &c. They spend their days in wealth, and in a moment go down to the grave; that is, as the Dean rightly explains it, without sickness, or the terrors of slow-approaching death; the lot which prosperous libertines of all times, who believe no future reckoning, most ardently wish for. 217. And is not this now perfectly agreeable with JOB's thesis? that God will punish the wicked in this life.*

And as to God's bringing the good man out of trouble, JOB seems to have had so little notion of it, that he thinks of nothing, and wishes for nothing, so much as death. *I know, says he, that thou wilt bring me to death, and to the house appointed for all living. xxx. 23.*

Here the reader will do well to recollect the peculiar circumstances of this distressed patriarch. For when the author of the D. L. makes him to hold, that God will at length bring the good man out of trouble, the meaning is, that *he himself shall be restored to his former felicity. 302. n.* His former happiness

happiness consisted in *ample revenues, friends, respect, extensive influence, a flourishing family,* and, one of heaven's best gifts to man, *health* to enjoy all those blessings. In his present situation, he was, in all respects, the reverse of this; *without estate, without friends, without respect, without influence, his children dead, and he himself---dying daily.* This is the man! who expected a *restoration* to his former felicity: And yet we no where read of any *Bedlam* provided for his reception. May we not, however, beg leave to ask, What were this good man's expectations, when he declared, upon the loss of his fortunes, and of his children, *Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and NAKED SHALL I RETURN THITHER?* But I hope, we shall not be told, that this too proceeded from the *distemperature of passion, and the extravagance of expression.*

II. In the second place, if we have given a right interpretation of the book, a *temporal deliverance*, and not the *resurrection of the body*, must needs be meant. 303. And elsewhere, the end and design of the composition, as explained above, absolutely disclaims this latter sense, and requires the former. 296.

The Dean's pompous account of his interpretation is worth transcribing.---It may not be improper to remind the *answerers* of this dissertation, the *miscellaneous writers* on the book of *JOB*, that they would have done their duty better, and have given the learned and impartial

impartial public more satisfaction, if, instead of laboring to evade two or three independent arguments, though corroborative of my interpretation, they had, in any reasonable manner, accounted, How this interpretation, which they affect to represent as visionary and groundless, should be able to lay open and unfold the whole conduct of the poem upon *one entire, perfect, elegant, and noble plan*, which does *more than vulgar honor* to the writer who composed it. And that it should, at the same time, be as useful in *defining the parts*, as in *developing the whole*; so that particular texts, which, *for want of sufficient light*, had *hitherto* been an easy prey to critics from every quarter, are *now* no longer affected by the common opprobrium affixed to this book, of its being a *nose of wax*, made to suit every religious system. Of which, amongst many others, may be reckoned the famous text just now explained. *All this, our hypothesis* (as it is called) *has been able to perform*, in a poem become, through time and negligence, so desperately perplexed, that commentators have chosen, as the easier task, rather to find their own notions in it than to seek out those of the author. 309.

Quæsitam meritis sume superbiam!
 But what will the *learned* and *impartial public* say, when they shall find that, if the boasted interpretation of the book is right, the RESURRECTION OF THE BODY, and not a *temporal deliverance*, MUST NEEDS BE MEANT.

MEANT. For he tells us, the Jews learned the *doctrine of a future state* at a time when their extraordinary providence was departing from them. 281. The moral of this dramatic piece therefore *was* to assure the *people*, represented under the person of this venerable patriarch, “ of a *resurrection* and a *future state*,” in order to allay that tumult of mind which arose in every one, on seeing the extraordinary providence, which protected their forefathers, now just about to be withdrawn from them. 303. And the finding SATAN in the scene is a *certain proof*, 279. that a *resurrection of the body* is the subject of the text. For the *history of this personage*, it is evident, *the Jews were brought acquainted with in their captivity*. 281. And *his history* having an *inseparable* connection with the *redemption* of mankind, the knowledge of them was to be conveyed *together*. *ibid.* We conclude then, with saying of JOB, what the Dean has said of the later prophets, He has given a *very lively description* of the REDEEMER, and the other attendant truths; Two of the principal of which are the HISTORY OF SATAN and the DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE STATE. *ibid.* *Dixin’ ego in hoc esse vobis Atticam elegantiam!* He adds, that the knowledge of a future state was at this time, when the extraordinary providence was departing, of the highest advantage and support to the Jews as a nation and a people. 281.

Some-

Sometimes the extraordinary providence is a supply for the want of a future state. Then again, to bring matters round, a future state is made to supply the want of the extraordinary providence. But may we not fairly ask this dealer in paradoxes, How the knowledge of a future state could, at this time, yield any high advantage and support to the Jews? And what will he answer? Were the later prophets lawgivers? If not, to what purpose was it to acquaint their people with the *doctrine* of future rewards and punishments, unless they could, at the same time, make them the *sanctions* of their religion? It is the Dean's great business to shew, that *temporal* rewards and punishments *ONLY* were the *sanctions* of the *Jewish* religion and law. And, he very well knows, the prophets had no authority to annex *any other*.

We may also ask him farther, *Where* have these prophets taught a future state? for though he talks of this so frequently, yet, it is remarkable, he never once attempts to prove it. He has indeed, on a different occasion, produced a passage from *Zechariah*. *It shall be that whoso will not come up of all the families of the earth unto Jerusalem, to worship the king the Lord of hosts, even upon them shall be no rain.* xiv. 17. Now here, as the Dean confesses, the prophet is foretelling that *new* dispensation, *by which* life and immortality were brought to light. 140. But of what use were the *sanctions* of this *new* dispensation

dispensation to a people who were to live and die under the *old* one? It is no less observable, that even these *future* rewards and punishments of the gospel are described under the ideas of the Jewish œconomy. I would have those men (says he, with his usual insolence) well consider this, who persist in thinking, that the early Jews had the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments, though *Moses* taught it not expressly to them; and then tell me why *Zechariah*, when prophesying of the gospel-times, should chuse to express these *future* rewards and punishments under the image of the *present*? 141. Surely *that man* should well consider this, who can persist in saying, (for he cannot possibly persist in thinking) that the *prophets* have developed the *bidden* sense of the law; and then tell us, why *Zechariah* should chuse to foretell the *spiritual* things of the *new* dispensation under the *carnal* images of the *old* one?

III. The understanding the words of a *resurrection of the body*, expressly contradicts *JOB*'s plain declarations against any such hope, in the following passages. 303.

Vii. 9. *As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away, so he that goeth down to the grave shall come up no more*---Where? It follows immediately in the next verse, which the Dean, for certain good reasons, has suppressed. *He shall return no more to his house, neither shall his place know him any more.* Agreeably with what he says elsewhere.

Before

Before I go whence I shall not return, even to the land of darkness, and the shadow of death; a land of darkness as darkness itself without any order, and where the light is as darkness. x. 21, 2. And again, xvi. 27. When a few years are come, then I shall go the way whence I shall not return.

Xiv. 12. So man lyeth down, and riseth not till the heavens be no more; they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep. Clarus and Drusius on the words till the heavens be no more, say, *Intellige in æternum*---est sensus, nullo unquam tempore, nam cœlum semper erit. It is not in human language to express a denial of the resurrection of the body in stronger or plainer terms. 304.

Doctors differ. *Vatablus*, a very learned and judicious commentator, says the Bishop, makes no doubt of refering this passage to the resurrection in the day of God's visitation. For it was a very old opinion, * that the present frame of nature should be one day dissolved, and be succeeded by new heavens and a new earth. 225. Indeed it was hardly possible for this good patriarch to have expressed his hopes of a resurrection in plainer or

* His lordship, says the Examiner, asserts that the opinion was very old. But this is not enough. He should prove that it was as old as the age of Job. Now as he has not attempted to do this, he seems to beg the question, which he should have proved. 375. This is the pleasantest of all Examiners. He should prove that the opinion was as old as the age of Job. As if the very text itself was not a proof of it! when we know it was both old and true.

or stronger language. The dissolution of the heavens and the day of judgment are inseparable. And the Dean himself has acknowledged so much. 471. JOB therefore had good reason to say, that when he *lay down*, he should not *rise again till* the general resurrection, when the heavens shall be no more.

The Dean concludes with the following text, which he leaves to shift for itself. *If a man die, shall he live again?* 14. This question is equivocal, and may signify, either that man shall live, or shall not live. But the context determines its meaning. In the preceding verse he says, *Oh that thou wouldst hide me in the grave, that thou wouldst keep me secret, that thou wouldst appoint me a set time, and remember me.* What time was it, do you imagine, that JOB desired to be appointed for him? Was it the time of this life? If so, how could it succeed his being hid in the grave? No, says the learned prelate, he had other hopes, and expected to be called from the grave, and seems assured that God would not desert his creatures even there. *Thou shalt call, and I will answer thee; thou wilt have a desire to the work of thine hands.* 241. But the words thus interpreted, directly contradict many other declarations of JOB, particularly one just before, *For now I shall sleep in the dust, and thou shalt seek me in the morning, but I shall not be;* The most express declaration to the contrary. 513. 2d Ed. Gently, good Mr. Dean! for, in your haste, you have got

a conclusion without any premises to support it. This declaration *just before* is just seven chapters off. But be it where it will, it is nothing to the purpose. Between the time of death, and the time of the resurrection, *man*, we confess, *is not*. But does it therefore follow, that he *never will be*?

Here let me observe, once for all, that the proper point in debate is, whether Job, and the early Jews knew any thing of a *resurrection*. All those texts therefore, that may be brought to prove their ignorance of an *intermediate state*, are beside the question. Hence appears the impertinence of the passage in *Hezekiab's* thanksgiving, urged to *evince*, That the body of the early Jews had no expectations of a future state of rewards and punishments. D. L. 173. *The grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee; they that go into the pit cannot hope for thy truth. The living, the living, he shall praise thee, as I do this day; the father to the children shall make known thy truth. Is. xxxviii. 18, 9.* The dead are here plainly opposed to the living. This passage therefore can have no relation to a future state of *rewards and punishments*, because that, according to the scripture-notion of it, commences not *till* the general resurrection. And that *Hezekiab* had some expectation of such a state, may, I think, be certainly collected from another passage in this very thanksgiving. *I said in the cutting off of my days--I shall not see the Lord, even the Lord*

in the land of the living ; I shall behold man no more with the inhabitants of the world. 11.

Why does he *confine* his despair of seeing God and man *to this* life, if he had no hope nor expectation of seeing them in *another* ?

But since, of *all* the sacred writers, *the Psalmist*, says the Dean, is *he* who is supposed by the adversaries of the D. L. to have most effectually confuted the system. I shall quote a passage from *his* hymns which, I think, fairly enough decides the controversy. *I am counted with them that go down into the pit--Free amongst the dead, like the slain that lie in the grave, whom thou rememberest no more ; and THEY ARE CUT OFF FROM THY HAND. LXXXVIII.*

4, 5. *Let the serious reader take notice of the last words--they, the dead, are cut off from thy hand, that is, they are no longer the object of thy providence or moral government. 172.*

The serious reader must have very little understanding, if he can possibly be imposed upon in so gross a manner. Our psalmist, (whoever he was, for it is not certain that *David* was the author of the hymn, though the Dean has ventured to ascribe it to him) was at this time under the wrath of God for his sins, and seems, by his own description of his case, to have been smitten with the leprosy. He first compares himself to the dead in general. *I am counted with them that go down into the pit ; I am as a man that hath no strength.* He then compares himself to those in particular, who are taken away for their wickedness

wickedness by the immediate hand of God, and whom God would no more remember with mercy. *Free amongst the dead, like the SLAIN that lie in the grave, whom thou rememberest no more; and, or for, they are cut off BY thy hand.* The psalmist is not speaking here, as the Dean would persuade us, of the dead in general, but only of the wicked. Nor does he say, as is said for him, *that God forgets them.* 172. that is, *absolutely* forgets them, but that he so far forgets them, as not to shew himself favorably unto them. In this sense we are told, that *the butler did not remember Joseph, but forgot him.* Gen. xl. 23. And now let the serious reader take notice of the last words---*they, the wicked, are cut off by thy hand.* The author of the D. L. cannot object to the propriety of this translation. What then becomes of his arbitrary comment? *The dead are no longer the objects of God's providence or moral government.*---The sentiment of the psalmist is plainly this. My condition is like that of the wicked whom God has cut off in his wrath. And I have no more hope of being remembered by him in this world, than they have of being remembered by him in the next.

But if the author of the D. L. is indeed willing to have the controversy settled by the authority of *David*, I will produce a passage from one of his psalms, which will very fairly and effectually decide it. *Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption.* xvi. 10. St.

St. Peter, says Dr. Stebbing, claims this passage as relating to Christ's resurrection. But how does he claim it? replies the Dean. No otherwise than by giving it a *secondary sense*.-- Agreed. The question then is, Was David acquainted with the secondary sense? Or, in other words, did he understand the meaning of his own prophecy? It is of no great use to know the Dean's answer, or mine, to this question. I shall therefore transcribe the answer, which was given long ago by the apostle of the circumcision.--- *Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore being a PROPHET, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up THE MESSIAH to sit on his throne, HE SEEING IT BEFORE SPAKE OF THE RESURRECTION OF THE MESSIAH, * that HIS soul was not left in hell, or the grave, neither HIS flesh did see corruption. Acts xi. 29--31.*

To return from this digression.--For the rest, for any fuller satisfaction, the intelligent reader is referred to the *Free and candid exami-*

nation

* St. Peter is here reasoning with the Jews on principles drawn from their own scriptures. His argument stands thus: The Messiah, David's lord, was to rise from the dead, and be placed at the right hand of God. Jesus was raised from the dead, and placed at the right hand of God. Therefore Jesus is the Messiah the lord.

nation of the Bishop of London's principles, &c. where he will see in a fuller light than perhaps he has been accustomed to, the great superiority of acute and solid reasoning over chicane and sophistry, 310.

Ad populum phaleras.

This mighty hero, who is to do such wonders, is, in truth, no very formidable adversary. The *Examination*, as we shall quickly find, is a complication of the author's shuffles and mistakes. And indeed what else could be expected from a writer, who had undertaken the defense of such a despicable argument, as that of the *Divine Legation*.

The principal objection is drawn from some passages in the New Testament, in which, according to their interpretation, life and immortality is called the *mystery* of the gospel, which was first published and brought to light by Jesus Christ.

In answer to this, let it be observed, that, as the gospel contains many mysterious points, it may itself be very well styled, in general, a *mystery*, or the *mystery*, though the doctrine of life and immortality was revealed before. The Examiner indeed has denied this. The *gospel*, says he, must necessarily include every important and essential article of the Christian faith. Since therefore a *future life* was one of these essential articles, *IT* must have been a *mystery*, if the *whole* gospel was so. 364. I apprehend not, And perhaps the impartial reader may be of the same opinion, when he

considers the following passage in the epistle to the Hebrews. xi. 13. *These all* (the patriarchs beforementioned) *died in faith.* And yet it appears that *Enoch*, one of the instances, *did not see death.* Why then may it not be said, with equal propriety, *all* the articles of the gospel were *mysteries*; though a *future life*, one of those *all*, was revealed before.

Again---The term *mystery* does not necessarily imply any thing *absolutely* unknown. It was borrowed from the famous rites of Paganism so named, and applied with admirable justness. For as the *mysteries* were communicated only to a few of the wise and great, and kept hid from the populace, so *life and immortality* was revealed by God, as a special favor, to the holy patriarchs and prophets, but kept hid from the body of the Jewish nation. D. L. 183. Well then; extend this knowledge of life and immortality to the body of the Jewish nation, and it will still remain a *mystery*, as not having been communicated to the *Gentiles*.

In this sense the learned and judicious Dr. *Stebbing* understands that famous passage, the very *Palladium* of the Legation-scheme; *Jesus Christ hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.* 2 Tim. i. 10. He observes, with Bishop *Bull*, that the following words strongly point to this sense. For the apostle having said, that Christ had brought life and immortality to light by the gospel, instantly subjoins

subjoins, whereunto [that is, to which work of bringing life and immortality to light] I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the *Gentiles*; which seems to intimate, that *preaching to the Gentiles* was the thing *precisely* intended by *bringing life and immortality to light*. Exam. 73.

Add to this, that, according to the same apostle, the chief privilege of the *Jews* above other nations was, that *unto them*, exclusively, *were committed the oracles of God*. Rom. iii. 2.

But the passage may be pointed thus. *Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling [not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, but is now made manifest by the appearing of our saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light] through the gospel*---According to this reading, the apostle does not say, that life and immortality was brought to light through the gospel, but that we are *called by the gospel*. As this is said by St. Paul elsewhere, it may possibly be his meaning here. And what he says is *brought to light* is not the *doctrine* of life and immortality, but the *thing* itself. *This*, though given us in Christ before the world, and promised in every age of it, could not be *manifested till the appearing of our saviour*; it being his peculiar province, as such, to bring life and immortality to light. The sense of the expression here offered is

confirmed by the words immediately preceeding. *Who bath abolished death.* Now *death* was *abolished* in the same manner as *Satan* the author of death, and *sin* the occasion of it, were destroyed, by the *death* * of the *Redeemer*. *Life* and *immortality* therefore was brought to light by his *resurrection* from the dead. But what has the text, thus interpreted, to do with the *doctrine* of life and immortality?

Farther---The calling of the *Gentiles* is sometimes styled the *mystery of the gospel*, as Mr. *Locke* and others have observed. The Dean calls this an *absurd fancy*; for a confutation of which he refers us to his good friend, the learned and *most judicious* author of the *Examination*, who, he says, has sufficiently exploded it. 182. n. f. We are here told, among other things that are nothing to the purpose, that the *calling* of the *Gentiles* could be no more a *mystery* than the calling of the *Jews*; since the one was *as plainly foretold* as the other. 35. But was this foretold as plainly to the *Gentiles*? If not, then, with leave of this pair of writers, it would be a *mystery* to them, how plainly soever it was communicated to the *Jews*.

But

* *Heb. ii. 14.* The devil is here said to have the power of death, as he brought it into the world by the delusion of the first man. Therefore, before *death* can be abolished, He, who had the power of it, must be destroyed. But his destruction is the work of the second man. D. L. 185.

But there is a circumstance relating to this call of the Gentiles, which made it a mystery even to the Jews. I mean their being called in the place of the others, the Jews being rejected: *I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of THIS MYSTERY, (lest ye should be wise in your own conceits) that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. Rom. xi. 25.=15.* In their former captivities or dispersions they still preserved their relation to God, as his peculiar people. But at present they are *cast off*, and are no longer his. And now point me out a prophecy in the Old Testament, where this is *clearly and plainly* foretold.

But to come directly to the point. When the sacred writers speak of THE MYSTERY OF THE GOSPEL OR THE MYSTERY OF CHRIST, they generally mean THE WHOLE SCHEME OR DISPENSATION OF PROVIDENCE IN THE REDEMPTION OF THE WORLD BY THE SON OF GOD, in opposition to the *clear and full manifestation* of it by Christ and his apostles. Thus we find St. Paul speaking to the *Ephesians*. *Ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God, which is given me to-you-ward; how that by revelation he made known unto me the MYSTERY, as I wrote afore in few words, whereby when ye read ye may understand my knowledge in the MYSTERY of the Messiah, which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto, or by, his holy apostles*

apostles and prophets through the Spirit---iii.
 2---5. It is called a *mystery*, as the Bishop justly observes, because it was kept secret since the world began, God not having opened or declared his gracious purposes before the coming of Christ. With respect to this time of secrecy and silence the gospel is called a *mystery*; but, upon the revelation of it by Christ Jesus, it is no longer looked upon as a *mystery*, but as the manifestation of God's will and goodness to men. Vol. I. 132. His lordship does not mean, nor could he mean, (as the Examiner would persuade us) that God had never, in the ages preceding that of Christ, made any declaration of his gracious purpose of redeeming man, for he labors to prove that *something* of this sort was *promised* even to *Adam*; but he means, that God had never made known the *whole design* of the gospel, as he expresses it, the [whole] *dispensation* of providence in the salvation of mankind. *ibid.* St. Paul, we see, had the same sentiment. *In other ages* the *mystery* of the Messiah was *not made known* unto the sons of men *As it is now revealed*. Which necessarily implies, that it *was* made known in *some* degree, though not *so* clearly and intirely, nor in *such* a manner, *as it is now* revealed. What God reserved to himself, without communicating the knowledge of it to man, that remained a *mystery*. What he was pleased to reveal, was no longer a *mystery*, but a manifestation of his will and purpose. If
 therefore

therefore he communicated so much of his design to our first parent, as to let him see a *resurrection* in consequence of the *death* of the *woman's seed*, (and, the circumstances duly weighed and considered, we cannot well suppose him to have revealed less) this was but a small part of the *manifold wisdom of God*, (*ἡ πολυποικίλος σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ*) which is now made manifest to the saints. The Examiner therefore, and his master, do but trifle, and betray their ignorance of true divinity, as well as of sound logic, and of fair criticism, when they make a *future state*, which is only *one* article of the great mystery of godliness, the *whole* of it.

These gentlemen may quibble, as long as they please, about the terms *mystery*, *secret*, *purpose*, *bidden wisdom*, made *manifest*, and *brought to light* by the *gospel*. But, after all, the question is a question of *fact*; and in order to decide it, we must appeal, I think, not to the evidence of *Paul*, but of *Moses*. And if the prophet says, a future state *was* revealed, the apostle could never mean to say, it was *not* revealed.

And are not these very writers forced to take refuge in the restrained sense of the term *mystery*, when they come to explain their own system? If *life* and *immortality* *was* brought to light through the *gospel*, consequently, *TILL* the preaching of the *gospel*, it was kept *hid* and *out of sight*. D. L. 181. This is the specific *nosstrum* of the system. The author

at the same time maintains, that the *dark veil*, which the first set of prophets had throwed over this doctrine, was gradually *drawn aside* by the latter, who, after the captivity, gave *very lively descriptions* of the Redeemer, and the other attendant truths; *one* of which was the *doctrine of a future state*. 200. 281. 352. 372, 3. But if the latter prophets drew aside the veil, where was the mystery? If they gave such lively descriptions of the Redeemer, and of the future state, how could it be first brought to light by the gospel? Unless he will chuse to maintain, as an embellishment to his uncommon system, *two first and original* revelations of this doctrine; one by the prophets, and the other by Jesus Christ and his apostles.

And, in fact, that *most judicious* author, the Examiner, has presented us with a *pair* of such *original* revelations. The publication of life and immortality ascribed to *Jesus Christ* must have been the *first and original* publication. 6. 218. 365. His system obliged him to hold this. His system obliged him to hold also, that the *original* revelation of it was made to *Abraham* and to some other select persons. 72, 3. Here are evidently, in his own words, *two original* manifestations of life and immortality. To which he might have added, in perfect conformity to Legation-principles, a *third* original, to the people by the prophets.

Would

Would the reader know, how this gentleman came to entangle himself in such an express contradiction? It was thus. He must needs be starting objections for Infidels, only to shew his own and his friend's skill in removing them. We find, says he, in the New Testament *many* passages which declare this doctrine was *not* revealed in the ages before and under the law, and meet with some *few* which declare it *was* revealed to certain particular persons. The Deists ask, how we can solve this contradiction? The author of the D.L. tells us, that it had been communicated, *as a singular favor*, to some select persons, who were not allowed to communicate it to others, being not, at that time, intended for popular and common use. And is not *this distinction* naturally suggested by the scripture representation of this doctrine, which assigns the *original* revelation of it to *one* age, and the *open* and *promiscuous* teaching of it to *another*? 72, 3.

Here is now a *distinction* for you, which, he says, it would be an *unpardonable rashness* to call arbitrary and groundless, as it is *impossible* to remove the infidel objection without it. *ibid.* And my lord Bishop, it seems, will be obliged to follow the author of the D.L. in this distinction. *ibid.*

But why must we be obliged to accept a counterfeit distinction, which we do not want, and which can be of no service to us? The deist asks, (when his objection, as occasionally explained

explained by the Examiner, is properly stated) how the revelation of life and immortality ascribed to *Jesus Christ* could be the *first* and *original* revelation, if this doctrine had been *originally* communicated to *Abraham*, his family, and other select persons? He is told, The *original* revelation is to be assigned to *one* age, and the *open* and *promiscuous* teaching of it to *another*. The great point then, the favorite tenet of the D. L. is effectually given up. The *first* and *original* revelation of life and immortality is confined to the age of *Abraham*. The manifestation of it by *Jesus Christ* was *not* the *first* and *original*, but only the *open* and *promiscuous* teaching of it. But are the terms *open* and *promiscuous* equivalent to the *first*, *original*, and *bare bringing it to light*? Or could the revelation of a future state by *Jesus Christ* be the *first* and *original* revelation, if it had been *originally* revealed before?

These writers think their opinion is greatly strengthened and confirmed by some other passages, which represent the *Jews* as well as *Gentiles*, before the coming of our saviour, as *sitting in darkness*, and *in the region and shadow of death*. A proper character truly of a people acquainted with the revealed doctrine of life and immortality!

If there is any force in this objection, it will overturn the new system, as well as the old one. For the only difference between them is, that one assigns the knowledge of
this

this doctrine to the Jews earlier than the other. It is confessed by the author of the D. L. that they *learned* the doctrine of a future state some small time after their thorough *re-establishment*; 281. and that in the time of the *Maccabees* it was become *national*. 361. This dark state of the Jews therefore cannot possibly imply a *total, perfect, absolute, and intire* ignorance of the doctrine, as the Examiner dogmatically asserts. 11. The fact is against this exposition. The truth is, our quick-sighted critic has mistaken one object for another; the doctrine of life and immortality for the thing itself. This was the object, which our Redeemer came to illuminate or bring to light. When he rose from the dead, he made life and immortality itself visible in the regions and the shadow of death, where it had hitherto been invisible. The law of *nature* could not make the important discovery to the Pagan, nor the law of *Moses* to the Jew. This honor was reserved for the *gospel* of the sun of righteousness, who arose from the grave with healing in his wings, a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of his people Israel.

Another objection to the Bishop's interpretation of the text in *JOB* is drawn from the *types* in the law. For why need the doctrine of a resurrection have been hid and concealed in the Pentateuch, if it had been nakedly and openly exposed in other inspired writings? Ex. 159. And again, It would give one a strange idea of the administration of providence, to suppose that

that it intended to reveal and hide, or to open and cover, the same doctrine, at the same time. 160.

We must distinguish between the doctrine of a future state simply, and as it is connected with the doctrine of redemption. In the first sense, it is secreted no where; it is expressly revealed in the Pentateuch and the book of *Job*. In the other sense, it is either omitted or concealed in the Pentateuch. Thus in the history of the fall and redemption of man we find no *express* mention of the resurrection, though it is the very place where one would expect to see it. But the reason is obvious, The sacred writer could not make an open declaration of it, without previously explaining the sacrifice of Christ, and the doctrine of redemption, which lead the way to it. Now this, it is evident, would have been highly improper. The Jews were to be instruments in bringing about this important event by the death of Christ. If all this therefore had been nakedly and openly foretold, the designs of providence would have been frustrated, and the prophecy must have defeated its own accomplishment. Whereas *because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets, they fulfilled them in condemning him. Acts xiii. 27.* This is the true ground of the obscurity of prophecy in relation to the doctrine of redemption. Not that it was, in itself, improper to be known, or unfit to be published, in the times of the several prophecies, (this is the
great

great chimæra of the D. L.) but because it was absolutely improper for the age appointed for their completion. Now it is remarkable, that when our Lord suffered, the leading part of the Jews, and perhaps the high-priest himself, was of the sect of the *Sadducees*. But if the redemption of the world, *by the death of the Messiah the son of God*, had been directly and explicitly foretold, either by *Moses* or the prophets, no such sect could possibly have arisen; nor is it easy to conceive, that the Jews would have forwarded the crucifixion of a person pretending to those characters. *Obscurity* therefore, as an excellent writer observes, was *necessary*, that the persons concerned in bringing about the accomplishment might not know what was predicted concerning them and their actions. *Remarks on Eccles. History. Vol. I. 196.* For though the amazing scheme was planned by divine wisdom before the world, yet it was afterwards to be carried on and executed by human means, and consistently with human freedom. But had the Jews had more light, they must have had less agency.

Hence appears the absurdity of the Examiner's remark. His lordship, by supposing that these previous declarations * were *made*, brings upon himself the difficulty of explaining why they were not *recorded*. For certainly they would have been the most direct,
D precise,

* That the types were *types*, that is, significative of spiritual blessings to come.

precise, and circumstantial predictions of the mission of Jesus. [That is, direct, precise, and circumstantial prophecies would have been direct, precise, and circumstantial] But as the Old Testament was destined for the support and evidence of the New, one can hardly imagine, that such an illustrious train of testimonies would have been omitted, while others more dark, *ambiguous*, and *equivocal*, were inserted in their room. 104.

Why, the dark testimonies (I will not call them ambiguous and equivocal) were studiously inserted for that very purpose, that the Old Testament *might* attain its *destined* end, of supporting and bearing evidence to the New. Whereas, if it had contained direct, precise, and circumstantial predictions, its destined end must necessarily have been defeated; there could not possibly have been any New Testament for it to support and bear evidence to. The truth is, prophecy was given with a double view; not *only* to bear witness to the truth of the gospel, but *also* to be an immediate support for the hopes of the faithful. It is, doubtless, a mistake (as the Bishop has judiciously observed) to conceive prophecy to be intended *solely* or *chiefly* for their sakes in whose time the events predicted are to happen.---How low an idea does it give of the administration of providence, in sending prophets, one after another, in every age from *Adam* to *Christ*, to imagine, that all this *apparatus* was for their sakes who lived in, and after the times of

of Christ, * with little regard to the ages to whom the prophecies were delivered? As I think the prophecies of the New Testament

D 2

are

* The author of the D. L. has shewed as much ignorance as malevolence in his censure of this passage. The Bishop of London, (says he) in his discourses on the use of prophecy, seemed to have but a slender idea of this use [to afford evidence to future ages of the truth of christianity] when he wrote as follows—*How low an idea, &c.* But this is the way of those writers who have a favorite question to enforce. The truth of that (*if it happen to be a truth*) is supported at the expence of all others. Thus his lordship setting himself to prove that prophecy was given principally to support the faith and religion of the [old] world, thought he could not sufficiently secure his point without weakening and discrediting another of at least equal importance, *That it was to give testimony to the mission of Jesus.* 459. n.

His lordship was far from endeavouring to weaken or discredit this (or any other) truth. He was only guarding against a foolish conceit of some shallow reasoners, who would make it the sole use and intent of prophecy. Had it been so, as he goes on, a set of prophecies given some few years before the birth of Christ would have served our purpose as well as a series of prophecies given from the very beginning, and running through every age. 38. Indeed, supposing them to have had no use at all in the intermediate ages between Adam and Christ, they were all equally unnecessary. The reason seems to be self-evident. We must be in possession of facts, (suppose the death and resurrection of Christ) before we can form any argument from prophecy. *ibid.* If therefore I am once persuaded, by the testimony of the evangelists, that Jesus both died and rose again, what farther need have I of the evidence of the prophets? Prophecy then being given from the beginning, and running through every age of the world, must have had its use from the very beginning, and in every succeeding age; and it must have been of the same use to the antients, as the evangelical history is to us. And its use in regard to ourselves, is to shew us the real connection, relation, and dependence between the several dispensations of revealed religion; and to convince us, that Jesus is indeed the Messiah, the great object of prophecy, and of the hopes of the faithful, from the very beginning, and in every age, of the world.

are chiefly for our sake, who live by faith and not by sight; so I imagine the antient prophecies had the like use, and were chiefly intended to support the faith and religion of the old world. *Use, &c.* 37.

His lordship therefore had good reason for supposing, that the latent meaning of the types and secondary prophecies was occasionally opened and explained; because, otherwise, they could not have answered one end intended by them, the present instruction of the people. And it is no less evident, that if any prophecies were to be *recorded*, they must necessarily be obscure and typical; because, otherwise, they could not have answered the other end intended by them, supporting and bearing evidence to the truth of the gospel. View these prophecies then (as the Bishop says) with respect to those to whom they were given, they answered their wants and the immediate end proposed by God; view them with respect to ourselves, and they answer ours. 73.

We do not therefore assert, as the Examiner has falsely represented our meaning, that the *same* circumstance was *both* fit to be *secreted*, and fit to be *revealed*, at one and the *same* time, and to one and the *same* people. 99. But we mean, as a little common sense might have taught him, that what was fit to be revealed in one age, was as fit to be secreted in another; and that the vail or cover was intended to hide God's purposes from the Jews in

in our saviour's time; left the light of prophecy, like the heavenly light in St. Paul's journey to *Damascus*, should shine so irresistibly upon them, that they could not but see and acknowledge that *Jesus was the Christ*. This is St. Paul's account of the obscurity of prophecy, *We speak, or declare openly, the wisdom of God, in μυστηρίῳ τῆς ἀποκρυφισμένης, [hitherto] concealed and wrapped up in a mystery, which God ordained before the world unto our glory; which none of the princes of this world knew, FOR HAD THEY KNOWN IT, THEY WOULD NOT HAVE CRUCIFIED THE LORD OF GLORY. I Cor. ii. 7, 8.*

And now for the difficult question. What can be said to justify the use of types and secondary prophecies, if the doctrines, conveyed under them, were to be nakedly and openly revealed for the immediate instruction of the ancient Jews? 99. --- Because those doctrines were to be bladded and secreted from some later Jews.

My author proceeds thus. According to his lordship, the principal branches of the *Christian* religion had been revealed in the patriarchal covenant: and yet the rudiments and elements of this religion were delivered afterwards in the law. But is it possible, that persons, previously instructed in the more sublime parts of science, should after this be taught their elements, or that their time could be usefully employed in learning them over again. 232.

His remark is grounded on the absurd supposition, that what the *patriarchs* had been once told, their *posterity* could *not* possibly *forget*. Indeed, the future state itself it was impossible for them to forget. The hopes and fears of another life are so woven into the frame and constitution of the human nature, that they are a part of it. And the *Jews* must have been of a very singular make indeed, if they could be insensible to these visitings of nature, and forget themselves. But the principles, that lead to the future state, they might not, and, in fact, they did not remember. These are the sacrifice of Christ, and the doctrine of redemption. To prepare them therefore for these sublime parts of gospel-science, they were sent back again to the very first elements and rudiments of it, contained in the law, which was, on this account, *their school-master to bring them to the Messiah*, Gal. iii. 24.

Here the controversy might be fairly rested. *The law was to lead those who were under it to the Messiah, that they might be justified by faith.* The types and figures therefore must have been explained, or otherwise understood. Else how could the law have performed its office? How could it lead its pupils to expect *justification or eternal life by faith in the Messiah*? How could the Israelites believe on him, of whom they had not heard? In short, how could the law prepare the early Jews for the gospel, unless the one had led them to the other?

Let

Let me ask in my turn, says the Examiner, How the *horn-book* could be a *preparation* to the *Essay on human understanding*? And, I presume, he who can answer one question may easily answer the other. 237. n. Upon my word, a very shrewd query, and as shrewd a remark. But, I much suspect, they are founded on a blunder, the not distinguishing between the elements of a *language* and the elements of a *science*. If he had asked, How the *horn-book* can be *preparatory* to the *English language*? or, how the *elements* of metaphysics can be a *preparation* to metaphysics? the question had been to the purpose, and it might have taught him, that there is the same necessary connection between the *law* and the *Messiah*, as between the *alphabet* and *language*; or between the *rudiments* of a science and the *science*. But where is the sense in asking, How the *alphabet* can be *preparatory* to *metaphysics*? or, in the words of my author, how the *horn-book* can be a *preparation* to the *Essay on human understanding*? The very design of teaching a child *letters*, is that he may learn the *language*; the very intention of instructing a person in the *elements* of a science, is to lead him to the *science itself*. In like manner, the *law* was a *guide* to the *Messiah*. And would it not have been a most admirable *schoolmaster* to the antient Jews, if it had not led them, through the *elements* and *rudiments*, to Him who was the end of the law for justification to every one that believeth?

How much Christian knowledge was communicated to the Jews, or whether they understood the whole design of the gospel, is no part of the question. The sole point to be considered is, whether the law afforded the early Jews sufficient reason to expect eternal life by their Messiah? And here we produce the authority of *St. Paul*, who determines, in spite of unwilling hearers, that it was ordained for this very purpose. *The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto the Messiah, that we might be justified by faith.*

In truth, it is from this principle the apostle draws his conclusion, that *justification or eternal life is by faith in Jesus Christ*. The Jewdaizers maintained, that it was *by the works of the law*. To convince them of their mistake, he proves, 1. from the nature of the law, that it could not justify. 2. from the Abrahamic covenant, that justification was by faith in the promised seed, or Messiah. 3. from the concession of a Jewish prophet, that it was by (the same) faith. The Jewdaizers acknowledged Jesus to be the Messiah. Therefore, says the apostle, eternal life is by faith in Jesus, and not by the works of the law.---See page 87.

But though Moses was obliged to be so reserved in his account of life and immortality, as to hide it under types, when it stood connected with the doctrine of redemption, yet he has home express testimony to it in the history of Enoch's translation to heaven. *And*
Enoch

Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took, translated, him. Gen. v. 24. The author of the D. L. has indeed ventured to place this very history among the *studied obscurities* of the Pentateuch. 143. It is this writer's business to make obscurities where he cannot find any. Sure I am, there are none in the history. Moses is acquainting his readers with the manner in which the antediluvian patriarchs left the world. Adam, Seth, Enos, Canaan, Mahalaleel, and Jared, lived and DIED.----Methuselah and Lamech lived and DIED. Between Jared and Methuselah we find *Enoch*, of whom it is said, *He walked with God, and he was not, for God TRANSLATED him.* It is not plainer from the history that the other patriarchs died, than that Enoch did not see death. The author of the book of *Ecclesiasticus* saw the fact in this light. *Enoch pleased the Lord, and was TRANSLATED, for an example of repentance to the generations.* xliv. 16. Did he learn this from tradition (that trusty conveyancer of truth!) or from the history? Take it either way, it effectually overthrows the Dean's hypothesis. For what should hinder the antient Jews from learning it in the same way?

But how different is this, says the Dean, from the other history of the translation of Elijah? *And it came to pass when the Lord would take up Elijah to heaven by a whirlwind, that Elijah went with Elisha from Gilgal, &c.*

And

And it came to pass as they still went on and talked, that behold there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder, and Elijah went up with a whirlwind into heaven. 2 Kings, ii. 1---11. But the reason of this difference is evident. When the latter history was written, it was thought expedient to make a preparation for the dawning of a future state of reward and punishment, which in the time of Moses would have been highly improper. 143.

The reason of the difference is evident."--- It is so; it is so plainly pointed out by the historian, that, one would think, no reader of common sense could overlook it, nor any writer of common honesty pass it by unnoticed. The Spirit of the Lord, it seems, was wont to *translate* the prophet from one place to another, (1 Kings. xviii. 12. 2 Kings. ii. 16.) as he did *Philip* from the desert to *Azotus*. Acts viii. 39. Here was a necessity therefore that the historian should be very circumstantial in his account of this transaction, lest the infidels of the age might call the truth of the fact into question, and say that Elijah was removed *any where* but to heaven.

But the Dean has another evident reason. *When the latter history was written, ** it was thought expedient to make a preparation for the dawning of a future state, which in the time of Moses had been highly improper.---

This

* About the time of the captivity.

This is pleasant. But if that was the critical point of time for opening a view to another world, that too was the precise time for translating the prophet. For the translation was surely as strong a proof of another world as could possibly be given. So that, according to the ingenious hypothesis of the D. L. life and immortality itself was glaringly and fully held forth to view by the fact, almost three hundred years before a preparation for the dawning of it was made in the history.

Thus we see, that in no dispensation of religion has God left this important doctrine without witness. The translation of *Enoch* before the law, and that of *Elijah* under it, were proofs of the life and immortality which Adam lost. And the resurrection of *Jesus Christ* from the dead is a proof of the life and immortality restored by the gospel.

We have not yet done with the case of *Enoch*. The Dean says, It could not be but that a *separate existence* might be inferred, how obscurely soever the history was delivered. 199. This is owning a great deal. And yet if we were to ask him, Why a separate existence of the soul may be inferred from this story? he would be greatly staggered; it being full as good a proof of a separate existence of the body. Be this as it may; the intelligent reader will be apt to infer, that the existence of the soul is a good proof of the future state of reward and punishment. No, says the Dean, the early Jews simply concluded that

that it returned to God who gave it, as appears from the book of *Ecclesiastes*, which speaks the sentiments of the Jews at that time. But as to any interesting speculations concerning its state of survivorship, it is plain they had none. 188, 9. They must indeed have concluded very *simply*, if they did not draw any interesting conclusions from such a promising principle. But why are we sent to the times and writings of Solomon, to learn the sentiments of the Jews in the time of Moses? To know *their* opinions, we must go to the writings of *Moses*, to the law and to the testimony. And they bear full evidence to the people's belief of a future state, if that is in the least connected with the survivorship of the soul. Their idolatry was founded on this very principle. *They sacrificed to DEVILS*, as *Moses* himself bears witness, *not to God; to GODS whom they knew not, &c.* *Deut. xxxii. 17.* These *devils*, as our translators call them, were not *fallen angels*, but the *souls of men*. *These*, says the Dean, in his explanation of the text, were the *dæmons of paganism*. 143. n. Here surely they must have had some *interesting* speculations, unless their religion was as unedifying as their philosophy. Nay, so strong, so prevalent, and, one would think, so interesting, were their sentiments of departed spirits, that we find an express law in the body of the Mosaic institutes to cut off all communication between the Jews and them. *There shall not be found among you any*
one

one that useth divination,---or a necromancer, an inquirer of the dead. The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee. *Deut. xviii. 10---15.* * This, I think, fully proves, that the people in the days of Moses had other sentiments concerning the *soul*, than that it barely survived the body. Else why was such a caution given to prevent any consultation with the dead? And why the promise of a constant succession of

* This manifestly relates both to a succession of prophets in general, and to the Messiah, THE PROPHET, above all the rest, in particular. The occasion demands the first sense; the words themselves determine the other. God is forbidding his people to go after the gods and the prophets of other nations, and is promising them a prophet of their own, in the room of Moses, who was soon to be taken from them. As the Messiah was not to appear for many ages, he alone cannot be intended by the prophecy. I understand it therefore of a constant succession of persons inspired, who might consult God for the people upon all occasions. Accordingly, after the death of Moses, we find Joshua, Samuel, and others, successively raised up for that purpose. And as the prophecy, in the strict sense of the words, is applicable to the Messiah alone; since He alone among the prophets is, in all respects, *like unto Moses*, I understand it also of him principally; it points him out above all the rest. A remark made in the last chapter of Deuteronomy, long after the death of Moses, strengthens this interpretation. *And there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses.* As if he had said---Though Moses declared that the Lord would raise up a prophet like unto him, and though God has indeed successively raised up several in *some* respects like unto him, yet this prophecy has not yet been accomplished in a strict and full sense; there has not yet arisen one like unto him in *all* respects; but this great prophet is still to come." And when he did come, the prophecy was applied to him by the author of it. *Acts. iii. 22.*

It may be observed, (perhaps not improperly) that the name of the *first* and of the *last* prophet after Moses was Joshua or Jesus.

of prophets to render such a consultation needless?

To return to the text in the book of JOB, the author of which was, probably, Moses himself. This passage is an unquestionable proof, that the doctrine of a future state, so far from being studiously secreted in the sacred writings, is expressly inculcated by them, when the mystery of redemption does not stand in the way of such a revelation. The Examiner is pleased to say, According to his lordship's interpretation of the text, the great *mystery of the gospel* was delivered plainly and distinctly in all the lustre of *Christian* knowledge. 174, 5. And the Dean seems to glance at his lordship's interpretation. It may be said by those who hold the book of JOB to be the *earliest* scripture, that the Jewish people must not only have had the knowledge of a *future state of rewards and punishments*, but, what is more, of the *resurrection of the body*, and, still more, of the *redemption* of mankind by the son of God. 201. Now where has the Bishop given this interpretation of the text? Indeed how could he give it? JOB's faith in his Redeemer is expressed in very general terms. *I know that my Redeemer is the life, and that he will raise up the dust at the last day.* Who this Redeemer is, whether God himself, or the son of God; and by what means the redemption was to be made, whether, strictly, by the payment of a ransom, or, in a looser sense, without any ransom paid,

is not expressed. It cannot therefore be proved *a priori*, that JOB's Redeemer is the son of God. And yet, when his lordship found in the New Testament, that the work of redeeming the world and of raising the dead is every where appropriated to the son of God, as his peculiar province, he had the greatest reason for saying, These words of JOB are a strong *prophecy* of the *office* and character of *Christ Jesus*, and a *plain prophetic* description of the grand article of the gospel. 228.

As his lordship supposes, that this text contains a more plain and distinct revelation of the great mystery of the gospel, than is to be found in the law and the prophets, it will follow, that the *Arabians*, and not the *Israelites*, were the *depositaries* of the divine oracles, contrary to the assertion of St. Paul, as it is explained by his lordship; This was the *Jews* chief advantage above others, that *unto them were committed the oracles of God*. 174.

For reasoning you cannot find this writer's fellow. It will follow, says this profound logician, that the *Arabians*, and not the *Israelites*, were the *depositaries* of the *divine oracles*. But, in the name of Aristotle! how can it possibly follow? Does it appear that the book of JOB was ever in the hands of the *Arabians*? Is it not supposed, as he himself (to serve a turn) confesses, * to have been written

* JOB was surely a prophet, though not under the law, and his prophecies were by divine providence recorded, preserved

written for the Use of the *Jews*? And was it not preserved in the Jewish canon as part of the oracles of God? With what face then could this modest gentleman say, that the Bishop's supposition was contrary to the assertion of the apostle? The Jews were surely as much the depositaries of this important doctrine when found in the book of *JOB*, as if it had been found in the law and the prophets.

But if the Jews were ripe for such a clear and distinct revelation of the great article of the final and ultimate religion, what occasion could there be to keep them under the *beggarly elements* and rudiments of the law? 173.

My author seems to think there was some occasion for this discipline. For he immediately adds.--If there was occasion to keep them tied down to these elements, would not such a previous information have been premature, as it would have disposed them to look down upon the law with contempt and disgust? 174. 33. 239.

This objection, like the rest, is retailed out of the D. L. If instead of a *shadow*, or faint outline of a design, the image itself, in full relief, had glaringly held forth the object intended, this object, so distinctly defined, would have *drawn the Jews from that æconomy* to

served, and published for the use of those who were. I speak on *his lordship's own system*, and on the system of those who suppose the book prior to any other part of the canon, and written by the hero of the piece. 204.

65
to which it was God's pleasure they should continue in subjection. 184.

Bigotry to a system (for *new* systems have their bigots as well as *old* ones) easily disposes men to assert any thing, even in spite of, and in contradiction to, their own principles. Here we are told, that a distinct revelation of the doctrines of *redemption* and a *future state* would have been *premature* in the days of *Moses*; not only as it would have disposed the Jews to look down upon the law with contempt and disgust, but as it *would have actually drawn them from it*. And yet these very objectors, when they have another point to puzzle, can tell us roundly, that, soon after the captivity, the prophets gave very lively descriptions of the *Redeemer*, and, the *attendant truth*, a *future state*. But if such a revelation would have been premature in the days of the former prophets, would it not have been equally premature in those of the later? [TURN to Page 104.

Had his lordship condescended to examine the arguments offered in the D. L. or had he but reflected how *poorly* and *contemptibly* his followers have supported their opposition, he would have found no *great encouragement* to affirm, even that a *future state* had been revealed to the *Jewish church*. But to pretend that the article of the *resurrection* should or *ought* to have been revealed too, will heighten and increase the difficulties which before were great enough in conscience.

E

The

The more sober writers against the D. L. attempt no more than to shew, that a future state had been revealed to the Jews. But his lordship now tells them, they have mistaken the point in question, and misemployed their time and pains. For that the argument requires them to prove, that the article of the *resurrection was revealed* together with the doctrine of a future state; since the last could have no solid establishment or support, and consequently no influence, without the first. *However* (what is most to be lamented) *he assures them*, at the same time, that *this neither has, nor ever can be proved*, (a) as the *resurrection was reserved* to be revealed in the gospel. And is not this telling them, that the argument of the D. L. is actually *impregnable, and superior* to all their efforts?

It is far from a wonder, that the writers against the D. L. should have failed in their attempts to discredit and invalidate the great argument of the book: But it may seem a little strange, that their *very opposition* should drive and force them upon such principles, as tend to *establish and confirm* it. This is evidently the case of Dr. Stebbing. This too, I predict, will be the case of all who shall adopt the principle advanced in his lordship's sermon,

(a) Since his lordship therefore confesses, that the Jewish system had no such revelation, he gives up its title to a divine original."—If this be true, what shall we think of the Bishop? If it is false, what shall we think of the Examiner!

sermon, in order to carry on the same *wise* and *candid project*. 268, 9. 271.

Now, for all this huffing, the argument of the D. L. so far from being impregnable to the principle in the Bishop's sermon, is effectually overthrown by it. And where, let me ask, is the want of wisdom, or the want of candor, in applying this principle to the ruin of a system, which the most candid Divine, if he has any wisdom, cannot approve?

It is really a very hard case, that gentlemen may not differ in their sentiments from the author of the D. L. (whether they *profess* to dissent from him, or not) without being fallen upon, in a most outrageous manner, either by the author himself, or by his fellows. A mere *suspicion* that the argument of the D. L. was aimed at by the Bishop of London, has brought down upon that illustrious prelate a torrent of the foulest and most abusive language. And the worthy Chancellor of Lincoln has felt the effects of *happening* to differ from him, for he never read the book. The *Warburtonian* insolence rises, on this occasion, if possible, above its usual height. If it be asked, says he, How a doctor of laws, a minister of the gospel, and a judge ecclesiastical, would venture to amuse us with so strange a fancy, all I can say for it is, *he had the pleasure*, in common with many other witty men, of *writing against the D. L.* and he had the pleasure too, in common with many wise men,

of *thinking* he might *indulge himself in any liberties against a writer whom he had the precaution not to name* :--- But he says, he never read the D. L. I can easily believe him; and will do him this further justice, that, when *many have written against it without reading it, he is the first who has had the ingenuity to own it.* Pref. ii. Vol. 2---Such a *Drawcanfir* in theology should be treated accordingly. For who is this *uncircumcised Philistine*, that he should thus defy the armies of the living God?

The boasted DEMONSTRATION rises thus.

The doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments is necessary to the well-being of civil society.

This doctrine is not to be found in, nor did make part of, the *Mosaic* dispensation.

THEREFORE the law of Moses is of divine original.

The disputable proposition is very inaccurately expressed. For where is the mighty wonder if a doctrine, which is not to be found in the *Mosaic* institution, should make no part of it! The author ought to have said, *This doctrine made no part of the Mosaic dispensation, nor is to be found in it.* Now if it shall appear, that a future state of rewards and punishments, though really no constituent part of the legal dispensation, is yet to be found in it, then this phantom of a *demonstration* sinks into its original nothing. The

The demonstrator would indeed persuade us, that the question is concerning a *future* state's being the *sanction* of the *Jewish law*. 186. And, as if he really thought so, he says, where he puts the sum of his proofs together, "The Mosaic institution was without this support;" and he tells us, that a very moderate share of reflection might have led the candid reader to understand, that he had here *effectually* performed what he promised. 523. He promised to make good a proposition consisting of *two* distinct parts. He has performed his promise as to *one* part, by proving (what no body denied) that a future state was not the sanction of the Jewish law. The other part, that a future state is no where to be found in the Mosaic dispensation, remains to be proved. And, I presume, the attentive reader will agree with me, that, without a proof of this part of the proposition, the demonstration is imperfect. The Dean himself seems to have been conscious of this imperfection. For he says elsewhere, in order to *cover* it, if possible, from the reader's view, *Thus* it is now proved beyond all reasonable question, that the *doctrine of a future state is not to be found in*, nor did make part of the Mosaic dispensation. 187.

But there are more ways than one of taking this great reasoner by * *his horns*. Infidels had objected, that the Jewish religion,
 E 3 wanting

wanting the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments, could not come from God. The Dean replies, to the confusion of infidelity ! that the *omission* of this doctrine in the law is a *demonstrative internal proof* of its *divinity*. How so ? Why, the *extraordinary* providence, *exactly* rewarding and punishing, made the doctrine of a future state *needless* to all the ends of *civil society*. For the doctrine being propagated by statesmen, only as a *succedaneum* to an *unequal* providence, when that *inequality* was *rectified*, there was *no farther occasion for it*. *Appendix to the Alliance.* 171.

This, I think, will not satisfy the deist, whose objection reaches farther than the Dean was willing to see. He will say, Without inquiring in what manner the Jewish lawgiver may have provided for the ends of civil society, it will be sufficient to observe, that his religion had each *individual*, as well as the society, for its *subject*. These *individuals* would be often exposed to the inconveniences of an *unequal* providence. The doctrine of *future* rewards and punishments therefore was absolutely *necessary* to support God's *moral* government. Consequently, the *Jewish* religion being without this support could *not* proceed from God.

That the particulars of the Jewish nation were frequently under an unequal providence, is a fact too plain to be denied, or to need a proof. The law itself was founded on the most apparent inequalities. But these *inequalities*

lities, such as the *punishment* of *posterity* for the crimes of their forefathers, and of *subjects* for their kings, were indeed the effects of a *most equal* providence. D. L. Vol. 2d. 445. 2d ed. There is nothing this man will not employ for the support of his absurdities. He will borrow aid even from a quibble or equivocation. These severities, considered as the punishments of a *guilty prince*, or a *guilty parent*, were indeed the consequences of a *most equal* providence. But the objection relates to the *children* and the *subjects*; and in that respect they were as plainly the effects of the *most unequal* providence. For what can be more unequal than to treat the good and the bad, the innocent and the guilty, in the same manner? Since then the extraordinary providence did not, in these instances, exactly reward the good, though it did indeed exactly punish the bad, there was the greatest necessity for the support of a future state, (the statesman's grand *succedaneum*) when these inequalities should be rectified. And consequently, as Moses made no such provision, the infidel's objection to the divinity of the law, drawn from the omission of that doctrine, remains not only unanswered, but---unanswerable.

It is time to return to the principle advanced in the Bishop's sermon, and to see how the argument of the D. L. is affected by it. I say, the principle *in* the sermon, because the Examiner has thought proper, for no very

good purposes, to advance a principle for his lordship that is *not* in the sermon. His lordship maintains, that the law afforded a good proof of a *resurrection*. And yet, according to the Examiner, he *declares*, likewise, in this very sermon, that the *principle* of the *resurrection* was *not* discovered before the coming of our saviour. 271. 64, 5. 208, 10. 254. 276. 313. Now the Bishop was so far from making any such declaration, that he has produced our saviour himself as a witness to the law's affording good proof of a *future life*, namely, in the *resurrection*. Vol. I. 188. The truth is, our Examiner has either ignorantly or wilfully mistaken the drift of this masterly discourse, and has by that means made his *fifth* chapter one intire piece of impertinence. What his lordship says of *natural religion*, and of natural religion *only*, the other makes him say of *revelation also* before the gospel. And what the sermon calls the *gospel-evidence* of the *resurrection*, is simply styled in the Examination the *revelation* of the *doctrine* of a resurrection. I will here transcribe what the Bishop has said on this occasion.

There are two things necessary to confirm us in the belief of a resurrection to come; the knowledge of the *power* of God, and of the *will* of God. The *power* of God we may learn from REASON and NATURE. But the GOSPEL has declared both his *will* and his *power*--which he confirmed in the raising his own
son

*son from the grave; and better evidence we could not have for the possibility and certainty of a resurrection.---This evidence of the gospel has reinstated NATURE in all her hopes, confirmed her right to immortality, and taught her to triumph over death and the grave, which seemed before to be immoveable bars to all her expectations. This has restored religion, [the religion of nature] which had hardly one sound foot to stand on, and made our faith and our reason consistent, which were before at too great distance. NATURE indeed taught us to hope for immortality; but it was in spite of sense and experience, till the great prince of our peace appeared, who brought life and immortality to light through his gospel, 208. **

Nothing is required to reach the Bishop's meaning, but a tolerable head, and a good heart. In short, his lordship writes with great sense and discernment, and he may justly expect that his readers should have some.

Well then; to elude the argument of the D. L. we must suppose, says the Examiner, that the Jewish revelation afforded a clear and perfect

* The attentive reader will observe, that the gospel-revelation of a future state is not a discovery of *our resurrection to come*, simply, but as it is connected with *our Lord's resurrection past*. St. Paul proclaims the future judgment to the Athenians on this very principle. *God hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance to all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead. Acts xvii. 31.*

perfect assurance of the certainty and *reality* of another life. And does not the Jewish revelation afford this assurance? *That the dead are raised* EVEN Moses shewed, declared, revealed, manifested, (for the original will bear the strongest of these senses) at the bush, *when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.* Luke xx. 37. From whence it appears, says the Bishop, that our *saviour thought the law of Moses* afforded *good proof* of a *future life.*" So thought the *Pbarisees*; the very *Sadducees* were silenced. But no reasoning or authority is sufficient to silence the affected ignorance of the Dean, and the real ignorance of the Examiner.

Without entering into a critical inquiry concerning the exact etymology of the Hebrew word ELOHIM, it will be sufficient to observe, that the term is *relative*, and, according to our saviour's application of it, necessarily implies the *existence* of those persons to whom it is relative; as the terms *magistrate, parent, husband*, necessarily suppose the existence of their respective correlates. Let the word ELOHIM then be supposed to signify *covenanters*, (not in the sense of the *Hutchinsonians*, as expressing an *antemundane* engagement *between the three divine persons*, but in respect of a covenant between God and man) and see how the argument will stand. *I am the covenanter with Abraham, &c.* As if he had said, you have produced a passage from your law, which
in

in your opinion implies, that Moses disbelieved the *resurrection of the dead*. Now *Moses* was so far from disbelieving it, that *even* he himself has *revealed* it, when he calleth *Jehovah*, many years after the death of the fathers, the *covenanter* with *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*. For you cannot but allow, that the term *covenanter* necessarily implies the *being* of the persons covenanted with. The *covenanter* is not, cannot be, a *covenanter* with the *dead*, but with the *living*. *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, must therefore be still *living*---not as to their *souls* in a state of *separate* existence, but in their *bodies*---for all live unto him. Lost and insensible as they are to *us* and to *themselves*, they still live to their *covenanter*, who giveth life to the *dead*, and calleth those things that *are not*, as though they *were*.---I have only to observe, in vindication of this sense of the expression, that *Jehovah* the *Elohim* * or *covenanter* with the

Hebrews,

* A passage in Deuteronomy naturally leads us to this sense of the word. That thou shouldst enter into covenant with *Jehovah* thy sworn *covenanter* (*Elohim*) and into his oath, (*Elab*) which *Jehovah* thy sworn *covenanter* maketh with thee, that he may establish thee for a people to himself, and that he may be unto thee a *covenanter* by oath, as he has said unto thee, and as he has [already] sworn unto thy fathers, to *Abraham*, to *Isaac*, and to *Jacob*. Deut. xxix. 12, 13. It is true, the last radical is moveable in *Elab*, in *Elohim* it is immoveable. But this makes no difference as to the sense. The word *Amab* always loses its last radical in the singular number, but retains it in the plural. It is probable therefore, that originally there were two roots of the same signification, one with a fixed, the other with a changeable H. And the same may be said of *Elab* and *Elohim*.

Hebrews, answers exactly to the Ζεύς ὁρκιστής, *Jupiter fœderator*, *Jupiter the sworn covenanter*, of the *beathens*.

This is the real force of the argument; and in this view it is a *direct* proof of a *resurrection*. But can any thing, says the Dean, be more *irrational* and *absurd*?" He should have been cautious in his expressions on this occasion, lest his abuse may fall where it ought not. The very introduction, *that the dead are raised*, leads us to expect a *direct* proof. No, he says, it is an *intimation only* to what an *indirect* one tended." Our saviour then is made to argue thus. The *resurrection* of the body *may be inferred through the medium of the separate existence of the soul*, which *separate existence may be inferred* from the writings of *Moses*. But is there so close a connection between the existence of the soul and the resurrection of the body, that the one must be necessarily inferred from the other? He says indeed, the Sadducees supported their opinion, of *no resurrection*, on a principle that the soul fell into nothing at the dissolution; which principle once overthrown, they had nothing left to oppose to the preaching of Jesus." Who told him so? If the reader will take his bare word for it, he will believe any thing. Our Lord ascribes their infidelity to another principle, their *ignorance* of the *scriptures*, and of the *power of God*. And when he had once proved, that Moses shewed the resurrection of the dead, they had nothing farther

farther to object; it being a proof at the same time, that God was *able* to raise them.

But his reason for dissenting from the common opinion surpasses every thing. The reasoning is so far from proving that God was NOT *the God of the dead*, that it proves *he was*. FOR Abraham's *body* continued yet *lifeless* at the very time when God was called his God: whatever was to be the *future* condition of it, that *could not influence* the *present* appellation of the God of Israel. 344, 5.

A clause in St. Luke's gospel detects the fallacy, and exposes the sophist. *God, the covenanter, is not a covenanter with the dead, but with the living; FOR ALL LIVE UNTO HIM*—in their *bodies* unquestionably; for, as to their *souls*, they certainly *live to themselves* and to *each other*; but in respect of their *bodies*, which are now *lifeless*, they can *live only unto God*, in whose comprehensive view the *future* resurrection is *present*. St. Paul says much the same on a like occasion. *Abraham is the father of us all. As it is written, I HAVE MADE THEE A FATHER OF MANY NATIONS*, [not that he was at that very time, in fact, a father of many nations, for then he had *no child*; but only] *before him whom he believed, even God, the covenanter, who giveth life to the dead, and calleth those things which be not, as though they were.* Rom. iv. 16, 17. Will the Dean here say to the apostle, Can any thing be more irrational and absurd?

Abraham,

Abraham, at the time you speak of, had *no* child. With what propriety then will you style him a *father*? And, to heighten the absurdity! of *many nations* too? *Whatever* was to be his *future* condition, *that could not* influence the *present* appellation of *father*.' It is true, replies the apostle; in respect of such a *short-sighted creature*, as thou art, *future* relations cannot influence *present* names. But God seeth not as man seeth. With respect to *him*, whatever *shall be*, *is*. It is his peculiar prerogative to give *life* to the *dead*, and to *call* those things which *are not*, as though they *were*.

Thus it appears, upon our Saviour's authority, that even Moses taught the doctrine of a resurrection, when he called the Lord the *God of*, or the *Covenanter with*, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The argument is equally obvious and demonstrative. And this I take to be the true ground of the people's *astonishment*. There was nothing so *sublime* or *deep* in the argumentation, as to affect them in that manner; for no reasoning could be more plain and simple. But it was just matter of surprize and astonishment, that such an *obvious* proof had never been stumbled upon either by themselves, or by the Pharisees. And here, by the way, we have nothing to do with any *opinion* of the *Jews*, early or late, Pharisees or Sadducees; the single point in question being, not what the people believed, but what Moses taught.

Here

Here the Examiner makes his appearance. The Bishop's interpretation of the passage will oblige him to identify the two covenants, [the *Abrabamic* and the *legal*] and to assign to each of them the same common sanction of a future state. For by what rules of criticism and logic, or rather by what magic and enchantment, will any one be able to shew, that the phrase of being the *God of Abraham, &c.* must necessarily be confined to a *spiritual* sense in the book of *Genesis*, and to a *temporal* one in the book of *Deuteronomy*? 296, 9.

If there is any magic or enchantment any where, our writer is much under the influence of it; for he persists in blundering from one end of the chapter to the other. The title of the *God of Abraham, &c.* must necessarily have a *spiritual* sense in *Genesis*, and a *temporal* one in *Deuteronomy*: and the Bishop's interpretation is so far from identifying the two covenants, that it leaves them as distinct as it found them. The phrase, according to his lordship's account of it in his discourses on prophecy, is *relative* to the *Abrabamic covenant*. This covenant consisted of two parts; a promise of *redemption*, and a promise of the *land* of *Canaan*. If the law therefore was given in discharge, and as the accomplishment, of the *temporal* promise *only*, God, it is plain, could not be the God of, or the *covenanter* with, the *Israelites*, by virtue of the *legal* covenant, in the

the very *same* sense, as he was the God of, or covenanting with, *Abraham*, &c. by virtue of the *Abrahamic* covenant; for that included a *spiritual* promise likewise. To argue, as the Examiner does, from the mere phrase, without considering the nature of the covenants to which it relates, is neither consistent with sound logic, nor fair criticism. And hence appears the impertinence of the conclusion drawn by this shallow reasoner. Now if this promise made the *Abrahamic* a SPIRITUAL covenant, it must have made the *law* a SPIRITUAL covenant also, since it was as expressly contained in the one, as in the other. 297.

His lordship had plainly pointed out the distinction. The promise to *Abraham* consisting of two distinct parts, or including two distinct covenants; the one, relating to the temporal state and prosperity of his seed in the land of *Canaan*; the other, to the blessing, which, through him and his seed, was to be conveyed to *all nations* of the earth; the question is, to which of these two covenants the law of *Moses* is annexed. If the law was given in execution of *the promise* made to *all nations*, then have the nations nothing farther to expect; God has fulfilled his word: The *Jews* are right in adhering to their law; and we in the wrong in rejecting it. But if the law of *Moses* is built on the temporal covenant only, and given properly to the *Jews* only; then both *Jews* and *Gentiles* have farther hopes, and a just expectation remaining,
to

to see God's promise to *all nations* accomplished, which was not accomplished by the giving of the law. *Use, &c.* 140, 1.

And yet that wretched sophist thus goes on, confounding the two covenants, and insulting the great prelate in his own language. His lordship will own that the *promise*, made to *all nations*, was included in the declaration that God would be the *God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*, which is supposed to be the *whole substance and epitome* of the *Abrahamic* or *Christian* covenant. The *law* THEREFORE being given in execution of *this promise*, or to make good *this declaration*, there remains nothing farther to expect; God has fulfilled his word: *The Jews are right in adhering to the law, and we in the wrong for rejecting it.*

304.

Here must be something wrong somewhere; but whether it be in the head of the Examiner, or in his heart, let the reader determine. It is allowed, that the *promise*, made to *all nations*, was included in the declaration that God would be the *God of*, or the *covenanter with, Abraham, &c.* But what is immediately subjoined by way of inference, The *law therefore* being given in execution of *this promise*, or to make good *this declaration, &c.* is an empty fallacy. God's declaration to Abraham contained *two* distinct parts; a promise to *all nations*, and a promise to the *Jews only*. If the law therefore was built upon the *latter promise only*, it could neither

F

be

be given in execution of the *former*, nor to make good *that declaration*, the *whole* of that declaration, in which the other promise was *also* included. And consequently both *Jews* and *Gentiles* have farther hopes, and a just expectation remaining, to see God's promise to *all nations* accomplished, which was not accomplished by the giving of the law.

Once more, and I have done with this passage. According to the Bishop's exposition, Moses told the Jews, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, *notwithstanding the dissolution of their bodies*, were then enjoying the reward of their labors, or the future happiness which God promised when he engaged to be their God. So that good men were taught to expect, that the reward of their labors, or the future happiness appointed for them, was to be enjoyed in a state of separate existence.
306, 7.

The insolence, the fraud, the nonsense of this passage, (as the Dean somewhere speaks) is as much without example, as it was without provocation. The reward, or the happiness of those good men, which God promised when he engaged to be their God, was to be enjoyed *in the resurrection*. And to prove this, was our saviour's purpose, and the Bishop's purpose, in producing the text. The *soul* is not mentioned by either of them. But, by the help of the Examiner's *exposition*, Moses is made to tell the Jews, that the patriarchs, *notwithstanding the dissolution of their bodies*,
were

were THEN enjoying, *in their bodies, in a state* of the soul's *separate* existence, the FUTURE reward of their labors.

The reader is now to decide, whether the doctrine of a future state *is*, or is *not*, to be found in the law of Moses.

But if the doctrine of the resurrection and a future state was indeed revealed under the law, what occasion was there for an extraordinary providence, administering temporal rewards and punishments? 316---360. As this is made a question of great moment in the controversy, I will endeavour to give a full and satisfactory answer to it.

We are to remember then, that together with the promise to Abraham, *In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed*, which the Dean allows to be the mystic promise of redemption, God likewise engaged to convey to his posterity, in due time, the land of *Canaan* for an everlasting inheritance. When they were to be put in possession of this promised land, a government, in some form or other, must necessarily be established. In the peculiar circumstances of the Israelites, the *Theocratic* was requisite. For as they were to be separated from the rest of the nations, in order to revive and to preserve the knowledge of the true God amidst an idolatrous world, this separation could not otherwise be made than by bringing them under God's immediate protection. A Theocracy was therefore established; and Jehovah him-

self became from this time the *King* as well as the *God* of Israel. Hence flowed both the *temporal* rewards and punishments, as sanctions of the Jewish law, and the *extraordinary providence* to dispense them. For as temporal rewards and punishments are common to every mode of government, so the extraordinary providence was peculiar to the Theocratic.

And hence it appears, that as *future* rewards and punishments were not, so indeed they *could not be*, any *constituent* part of the *Mosaic* œconomy. For a *future* state having no manner of connection with God's *political* government of a *particular* people, but being inseparably annexed to his *moral* government of the *universe*; the *Jew*, it is plain, could have no more interest in it, in consequence of his national connections, than a *Turk* or a *Dutch-man* can have by virtue of the laws of their respective communities. And if the deist was to view the omission in this light, would he impartially consider the temporal sanctions of the law as part of an institute given by God to one people only, in quality of their local Deity and political governor; and that a future state has no dependence on such a partial scheme of government; I presume, he would not only withdraw his complaint, but would also acknowledge the honesty of the legislator, in not attaching to his institution what, he knew, could not possibly belong to it.

But

But though the doctrine of rewards and punishments in another life was not of the constitution of the law, yet it subsisted with it. Though Moses did not interweave it in the frame and texture of the new religion, yet neither did he take it from the old; but left it to rest, as he found it, on its antient footing, faith in the promise of God to the fathers.

So just is the Bishop's observation, that the true religion instituted by God has been *one* and the *same* from the fall of *Adam*, subsisting ever upon the *same* principles of *faith*. 75.

And here let me remark, by the way, the true reason, why future rewards and punishments, and not present, are the sanctions of the gospel. The Jewish Theocracy was a kingdom of this world; its sanctions therefore were of the same temporal nature. *My kingdom*, says the blessed Jesus, *is not of this world*; its sanctions therefore are fetched from the other, and are, like that, eternal. When the kingdom of God is *within* us, the laws and the sanctions must reach *there* too.

But whether the antient Jews knew any thing of *future* rewards and punishments, or not, their religion could not possibly subsist without *temporal*. The author of the D. L. and the Examiner are of opinion, that if it stood in need of such *external* helps, it must have labored under some *internal* weakness. 319. This weakness, on their scheme, was the want of a future state, to supply which was the peculiar purpose of the extraordinary providence,

providence. I cannot help thinking, on the contrary, that the weakness was in the men, and that the extraordinary providence was an *additional* support; as indeed Moses had need of every support, that either his knowledge, or his imagination, could suggest, to govern such an unruly people.

Hold, says the Examiner. The law would have stood in no more need of miracles and supernatural interpositions, or any foreign, extrinsic, and adventitious helps, than the gospel, if the Jewish religion had been established on the same doctrine of a *future* state. For *this* principle *must* have given the very *same* force and efficacy to *each* system, if it had belonged to them in common. 323.

Here now is penetration. The Jewish religion consisted in the worship of One God, exclusively of all others. But, in the days of Moses, the people were almost wholly given to idolatry, under every form and fashion of it. Their bias to the idolatries of *Egypt* [from whence they came] was inveterate custom; their inclination for the idolatries of *Canaan* [whither they were going] was a prevailing principle, that the tutelary god of the place should be worshipped by its inhabitants; and their motive for all other idolatries was a vain expectation of good from the guardian-gods of famous and happy nations. D. L. 44. In short, the Israelites, in their house of bondage, had been brought up in the principles of local and tutelar deities, and *intercommunity* of

of worship; in which principles they saw the whole race of mankind agree. 62. Of what use then would it have been *barely* to have told such a befotted people, that idolaters would be punished in *another* life? This was true; and yet, in the mean time, they would persist in all manner of idolatrous superstitions, to the intire ruin of their religion, which, as we have said, was to be appropriated to the One God. A religion therefore so circumstanced could not possibly be supported by the distant sanctions of a future state. And consequently there was the greatest necessity for the immediate interpositions of an extraordinary providence, to vindicate the supremacy of the *God of Israel*, and to keep his people in a steady adherence to him. These miracles were acts of government, and were the necessary consequence of the Theocracy. For, as the learned prelate justly observes, where the government itself was divine, the measures of the government must be of the same kind.

And it is no less evident, that these miraculous exertions of providence must be continued, as long as the occasions of them did. In the contest between Elijah and the worshippers of Baal, he laid before them this choice; *If Jehovah be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him.* 1 Kings. xviii. 21. But how was the dispute to be settled? Was Elijah to turn the people over to a future state, and tell them they would be all *damm'd*,

if they did not forsake *Baal*, and cleave to *Jehovah* only? Alas! the prophets of *Baal* were so numerous, and had so much interest with the people, that if our single prophet had attempted to oppose them with such a feeble argument, he would certainly have fallen a sacrifice to their resentment; and the destruction of *Elijah* would have been the establishment of idolatry. He therefore put the issue on this foot: *The God that answereth by fire, let him be God.* You know the event. The people declared for the Lord, and put all the prophets of *Baal* to the sword.

Hence we learn the true reason, why God was pleased to keep up a regular succession of inspired persons, to whom the Jews might address themselves, on all occasions, for instruction in their temporal concerns. The Pagan nations had their gods, their oracles, their soothsayers and magicians, and there was great danger lest the people of *Israel* should go and consult them, and so fall into idolatry; and, in fact, all these iniquities ensued in following times. That nothing might be wanting to guard against this corruption, that the transgressors might be inexcusable, [and that the supremacy of the God of *Israel* might be maintained] God positively forbade them to go after the gods, the priests, and the prophets of other nations, and promised them that they should never want a prophet of their own. *Remarks on Eccles. Hist.* 199.

This

This account is confirmed by the famous passage in *Deuteronomy*, where the divine law-giver in the same breath is forbidding the one, and promising the other. And indeed, without the promise, the prohibition would have been ineffectual. If Moses had not made a suitable provision for this kind of intelligence by the law, the people would have sought for it elsewhere.

We may learn this too from the reproof given to the messengers of *Abaziah*, who had sent to inquire of *Baalzebub* the god of *Ekron*, whether he should recover of his disease. Go, says the angel of the Lord to *Elijah*, *meet the messengers of the king of Samaria, and say unto them*; Is it not because there is not a God in Israel, that ye go to inquire of *Baalzebub* the god of *Ekron*? Now therefore thus saith the Lord, Thou shalt not come down from that bed on which thou art gone up, but shalt surely die. *2 Kings. i. 3, 4.*

It sufficiently appears from these observations, that the supernatural acts of providence under the law were directed against idolatry. If God, says the author of the D. L. oftener acted immediately in the kingdom of Israel [than in that of Judah] there was a plain reason for it. Its inhabitants were more given to idolatrous worship, and needed more the frequency of an extraordinary restraint. 82. And accordingly we find in fact, that when idolatry ceased among the Jews, (as it ceased after

after the Babylonish captivity) the extraordinary providence ceased too.

What is now become of the objection? Both the law and the people were so circumstanced, that the one could not be supported, nor the other kept free from idolatry, without miracles. Miracles therefore were necessary. The truth is, the supremacy of the God of the Hebrews was the essential part of their religion. And consequently, the supporting of that religion was supporting his own supremacy. The Dean himself, speaking of the *admirable provision* made by the Jewish law for preventing idolatry, observes, that the *immediate* benefits which followed the punctual observance [and the *immediate* punishments following the violation] of the law, had a natural tendency to keep the people attached to it. 61.

The doctrine of a future state therefore, and the extraordinary providence, are perfectly consistent with each other. And though the author of the D. L. and his *puffs* may boast the *impossibility* of defending revealed religion, on the supposition that the knowledge of a future state was always necessary and essential to the support of it; *Exam.* 355. yet they will never be able to shew the possibility of proving its divinity by an argument drawn from the want of that knowledge. The *equal* providence, as it is sometimes called, leaves both them and their demonstration in the lurch. For this providence, confessedly,
did

did not descend so far as to punish and reward every observer and transgressor of the law; *Exam.* 354. and the extraordinary providence to the state *might* sometimes *clash with that to particulars.* D. L. 446. 2d ed. What supply then had these particulars for the want of the doctrine of a future state? Every good man under the law, by the express conditions of it, had a claim to a reward in this life. But every good man did not find such a reward. Where then, may we ask, were these good men to seek it? The orthodox advocate for the law replies, In the next life. No, *Great defender of the faith*--of the antient Jewish church! D. L. 421. they had *no idea* of such a life. 174. Moses *confined* them to the *literal* sense of their temporal sanctions, and *stopped them from looking* any farther. 318. We thank you, good Mr. Dean, say the followers of the *first philosophy.* You have effectually done that for us, which we have never been able to do for ourselves. By this ingenious *medium* of yours, the want of a future state in the Jewish religion, you have very obligingly demonstrated the want of its divinity.----And will you, can you, *forgive him this wrong,* my reverend brethren? *

This *medium* is so far from being calculated to bring the deist over to revelation, that it revolts him at his very first setting out. Allow him this one principle, and he will proceed no

farther

* See D. L. 371.

farther. It is a demonstrative, internal proof to him, that the Jewish religion *could not* come from God. And can you think he will give himself the trouble to read fix bulky volumes, which pretend to prove it *did* come from him?

The only safe and rational method then of defending the law against the attacks of unbelievers, is to proceed on these plain principles, drawn from the law itself.

1. That the antient Jews were in possession of a religion, the sanctions of which were *future* rewards and punishments.

2. That these sanctions being insufficient to preserve a people, who had long dwelt, and who were going to dwell again, among idolaters, free from the contagion of such a general vice, God was obliged, as the most proper expedient, to keep them separate under his own immediate government, and to establish a Theocracy with temporal rewards and punishments.

3. That, in consequence of this mode of government, he was likewise obliged, in order to attach the people to the law, and to maintain his supremacy, to exert his almighty power in the various acts of an extraordinary providence.

There is a passage in the epistle to the *Galatians* much to our present purpose, which I will produce and explain.

To Abraham and his Seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but

but as of one, And to thy Seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law which was four hundred and thirty years after cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise. Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the Seed should come, to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one. Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid! for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. iii. 16---22.

The meaning of this passage is miserably obscured by the translation. St. Paul is proving against some Jewdaizers, that faith is the true ground of justification, and that the Gentiles are equally intitled with the Jews to the benefits of it. This he reasons with them on the authority of their own scriptures. *Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for justification; and, In thee shall all nations be blessed.* Well then, *they who are of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.* But as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse. Here again he produces scripture-evidence,

evidence, for it is written, *Cursed is every one who continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them.* No man therefore is justified by the law. And this, he says, is evident, for, according to the prophet Habbakuk, *The just shall live by faith.* But the law is not of faith, but of works, for, *The man that doeth them shall live by them.* He therefore that doeth them not is under the curse of the law. But the *Messiah* hath redeemed us from that curse, being made a curse for us; (for cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree) that the blessing of Abraham, the benefit of being justified by faith, might come on the Gentiles, as well as on the Jews, through *Jesus the Messiah*.

The apostle now goes on to prove, more particularly, from the Abrahamic covenant, that the faith, which justifies, is faith in *Jesus*.

Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth or addeth thereto. If a covenant between one man and another be unalterable, much more must a covenant be so between God and man.

Now to Abraham and to his SEED were the promises made. It (the scripture V. 8.) saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy SEED, who, according to your own confession, is the MESSIAH. St. Paul cannot mean, as the translators supposed him to mean, our blessed saviour, for that would have been begging the question, and coming
to

to a conclusion before he had established his premisses. He is arguing with his adversaries on their own principles. Whatever the modern Jews may pretend, their fathers always allowed, that the term *seed* denoted in this place, as well as in Genesis iii. 15. the *Messiah*. This is asserted by St. Paul as a common principle agreed upon between them, that to Abraham's *Seed*, * *who* is confessedly the *Messiah*, *were the promises made*. He then proceeds. *And this I say, that the covenant which was before confirmed with or concerning the Messiah, the law which was four hundred and thirty years after cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect*. This is a demonstrative proof, that the *Abrahamic covenant* must be still in force; it being impossible that the law could set aside an act which was established four hundred and thirty years before it. For, as the apostle goes on, *if the inheritance [of the blessing of Abraham V. 14] be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God freely gave it to Abraham by promise*.

Wherefore then serveth the law? may an objector say. If the law contributes nothing towards conveying the promised blessing, what was

* The syntax is remarkable. Τῷ ΣΠΕΡΜΑΤΙ οὗ, Οὗ ἐστὶ Χριστός. And it is no less remarkable, that the *Seventy* have translated the first promise of redemption in the same manner. *I will put enmity between thy seed and her seed, τῷ ΣΠΕΡΜΑΤΟΣ αὐτοῦ. Αὐτοῦ, &c. HE shall bruise thy head.* Did not these Jews understand the passage of a single person? And who could he be but the *Messiah*?

was its use? The apostle replies, *It was ADDED because of [idolatrous] transgressions, till THE SEED should come, to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.* To what was it added? To the covenant or promise mentioned before. Surely, says the Dean, to the religion of the patriarchs." Be it so; the religion of the patriarchs therefore must surely be different from that of the law; unless this great reasoner will take upon him to prove, that the same thing can be *added* to itself. Well then, for once the Dean agrees with the apostle, and allows that the religion of the law was added to that of the patriarchs; that is, the religion of *works* to the religion of *faith* in a promised Seed. And, in consequence of this concession, he must also allow farther, that this religion of faith subsisted under the Mosaic dispensation; *the law*, as St. Paul contends, and as the Dean confesses, being *added to it*. He will therefore be obliged to adopt the Bishop's principles; unless, for the sake of opposing his lordship, he will be hardy enough contradict the apostle.

That the Mosaic religion was not the same with, but an *addition* to, the patriarchal, appears farther from what follows. For having said, that the law was ordained in the hand of a mediator, *μεσίου*, the apostle immediately subjoins *Ὁ δὲ μεσίτης εἶνός ἡν ἐσιν*, *Now THE mediator (Moses) is not a mediator of*
one

one (and the *same* thing or covenant) *but* God, the covenanter, *is one* and the same. St. Paul always considers the promise to Abraham as consisting of *two* distinct parts, or as including *two* distinct covenants; (so he expressly calls them, *Gal. iv. 24.*) the one, relating to the temporal state of his posterity in the land of Canaan; the other, to a blessing which was to be conveyed, through him and his Seed, (the *Messiah*) to all nations of the earth. Now if the law was built upon one part (the *temporal* part) *only*, Moses, it is plain, could not be the mediator of *one and the same* covenant made with Abraham, which included the *spiritual* blessing of all men. The promise therefore of this blessing, and consequently *faith in it*, subsisted in its full force and vigor during the continuance of the law of Moses; for as that promise was not completed by the giving of the law, it remained to be fulfilled at the coming of the promised Seed, even Jesus the Messiah, the mediator of the better covenant established on better promises.

We learn from this passage,

1. That the religion of the patriarchs was founded on *faith in a promised Seed*, whom the Jews acknowledged to be the *Messiah*.
2. That this faith, though no constituent part of the law of Moses, subsisted with it.
3. That the law was *added* to this religion of faith *because of transgressions*, "the idolatrous deviations from that religion, into which

idolatry the rest were already gone, and the Jews then hastening apace; and from which they could be restrained no otherwise than by this addition. D. L. 361.

The author of the D. L. confesses, that Abraham and his family were acquainted with the doctrines of redemption and a future state.

437. n. It should seem then, that the Israelites, in the days of Moses, could not be quite so ignorant of this last doctrine, as the Dean, to serve his own purposes, has been pleased to represent them. A doctrine! which, he says, and he says truly, is most pleasing to the mind, gets the quickest possession of it, and most difficultly suffers a divorce. *Alliance* 170. Nor can it reasonably and truly be said, though it has been confidently asserted, that, because future rewards and punishments were not the sanctions of the law, the Jewish people, from the time of Moses to the captivity, had not the doctrine. D. L. 462. 2d ed. It is allowed, they had a prepossession in favor of it.

Alli. 171. And would not that prepossession, added to their natural hopes of immortality, spur them on to search their scriptures, if perhaps they might find the life they wanted? And surely if they did but seek, they could not fail of finding. The book of *Genesis* was not written for nothing. Read the history of the fall, and you will see the Seed of the woman triumphing, in his turn, over the serpent. *He shall bruise thee in the HEAD, for thou wilt bruise*

bruise him in the HEEL. Take the words literally, (and the Jews must have had the credulity of infidels to understand them literally) the prophecy is soundly ridiculous. Strip off the figure, and you immediately discover the divinity of the prediction. Some evil being had brought *death* into the world. What was the Seed of the woman to do, but to restore *life* and *immortality*? The *fall* of our first parents was the victory of the evil one. In what then could their victory consist, but in *rising again*? Who the evil being was, and who the Seed of the woman, are points that do not enter into the present question. But the Jews, if they made any use of their understanding, could not but see that the promise, in the *proper* sense of the words, contained a strong assurance of a *resurrection*, and, as the Bishop expresses it, was the grand charter of God's mercy after the fall. *Use, &c.* 72.

In what sense the Dean may chuse to understand this prophecy, I will not presume to say. There are but two ways, however, in which he can possibly understand it; either in the sense of believers, or in the no-sense of unbelievers. Let him take his choice. But, I hope, he will not reply on this occasion, as he did on another---If this be my alternative, Sit anima mea cum *philosophis*! they are much better company.

If we would know the sense of the faithful in the old world on this promise, we may learn it from *Lamech's* prophecy on the birth of his son, whom he called *Noah*, or *Comfort*; saying, *This same shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed. Gen. v. 29.* Now, whatever views the patriarch may be supposed to have had towards any temporal blessings, some spiritual blessing must necessarily have been the grand object of his thoughts, and of his prophecy. In the days of *Noah* the wickedness of man was so great, that God once said, *I will destroy man whom I have created, for it repenteth me that I have made him.* If this had been indeed the case, if the fatal sentence had been executed, what would have become of the covenant of redemption, the charter of God's mercy! What comfort could the few faithful have had in all their work and toil of their hands! But *Noah* found grace in the eyes of the Lord. *With thee*, says God, *will I establish my covenant. vi. 18.* Accordingly he was wonderfully preserved to continue the *Seed*, and to convey down this common blessing of all men. And *Lamech*, foreseeing this, declared, by the spirit of prophecy, *This same shall comfort US*---speaking to such of his contemporaries, as had the same common hope with himself of a deliverance from the bondage of corruption. The express words of the
prophecy

prophecy demand this sense of it. *Lamech* died *before* the flood. And therefore he could not possibly receive comfort or consolation from any *temporal* blessing *after* it.

Thus, I presume, it is proved to the satisfaction of every capable and candid reader, that, though future rewards and punishments were no constituent part of the law of Moses, the great legislator did not leave his people, as unbelievers, and some believers too, have been pleased to hold them forth, destitute of the knowledge of eternal life. What good end it can answer, to confirm the infidel in a persuasion so injurious to the honor of the Deity, (for what can be more injurious to his honor, than to represent him as *confining* his peculiar people to the *literal* sense of the *temporal* sanctions of their law, and *stopping* them from looking any farther?) let every impartial inquirer judge. It is indeed very easy for a fanciful writer to talk of a *divine harmony* inspiring each part, and reigning through the whole of God's grand dispensation, which would have been destroyed by the opening of a future state in the patriarchal and legal oeconomies. And it is as easy for a confident writer to say, that the omission is one of the most momentous truths that revelation has to boast of. But wise and modest men will be rather apt to think, that it was more agreeable

able with the goodness of God to reveal to the first man the existence of that future and eternal state, which is of the greatest importance to every man; with a charge to instruct his household after him, and to shew them the way of salvation. If we would know, says the Examiner, what was fit to be done at this time, our only way is to sit down, and inquire what he actually did do. 90. And whoever will search the holy scriptures with freedom and impartiality, unbiaſſed by *Legation*-principles, and not corrupted by the unclean spirit of refinement, will see and confess, that unto *Adam* was the *gospel* preached as well as unto us---not so clearly, openly, and explicitly, in all its several parts, as it is now revealed; but with a sufficient degree of light and evidence to make it the ground of a reasonable service, and to confirm his natural hopes of immortality. And he will also find, that the same covenant of redemption was afterwards, occasionally, renewed with *Noah*, *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*. On this covenant the hopes of the faithful were founded in all ages. On this covenant of *everlasting life* were expressly grounded the faith and hope of those martyrs in the history of the *Maccabees*, who would not accept deliverance that they might obtain a better RESURRECTION. 2 *Mac.* vii. 36.=*Heb.* xi. 35.

And

And I cannot help thinking, that the deist would give the gospel a fairer and more attentive hearing, if its advocates would uniformly join in recommending it as an universal system, reaching through all ages, extending to all nations, and graciously designed to bring all the sons of God unto glory; and in shewing, that the blessed author and finisher of the FAITH, JESUS THE MESSIAH, is, in his MEDIATORIAL capacity, THE SAME YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR-EVER.

A D D I T I O N S.

Page 47. line 25. And with this agrees St. Paul's declaration elsewhere;--saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come; *That the MESSIAH should SUFFER, and that he should be the FIRST that should RISE FROM THE DEAD, and shew LIGHT unto the people (of Israel) and to the Gentiles. Acts xxvi. 22, 3.*

Page 52. line 9. If we wanted any authority to justify so reasonable a supposition, we might appeal to that of the *Dean himself*, who assures us, in his *Sermons*, that The law was delivered under a carnal COVER, WHICH, for the sake of *what was to come*, the PROPHETS, from time to time, were EVER LIFTING up, and pointing to the SPIRITUAL substance beneath. Vol. I. 317.

Page

Page 65. Or if the people might be safely trusted with these doctrines in the time of *Malachi*, why not also in that of *Moses*? Or what reason can these writers possibly assign, why the Jews should adhere so steadily to the legal economy in any particular period of it, notwithstanding their knowledge of the Redeemer and the future state, which will not equally prove, that they would have adhered as steadily to it in any other?

ADDITIO W. S.

ERRORS.

Page 16 dele " and its relative,
56 for 87 read 93---7.



